DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 302 PS 030 452

AUTHOR	Taylor, Burton
TITLE	Current State and Local Initiatives To Support Student Learning: Early Childhood Programs and Innovative Programs To Better Address the Needs of Youth. Selected Presentations from an "Ensuring Student Success through Collaboration Network" Conference (Louisville, Kentucky, September 12-15, 1999).
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Jesse Stuart Foundation, Ashland, KY.
PUB DATE	2000-07-00
NOTE	101p.; Prepared and edited with the assistance of Barbara West and Lee Jernstadt.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Chief State School Officers, One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001-1431. Tel: 202-408-5505; Fax: 202-408-8072; Web site: http://www.ccsso.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents; At Risk Persons; *Childhood Needs; Conferences; Early Childhood Education; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Preschool Children; Program Descriptions; School Safety; State Programs; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

The Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network, administered by the Council of Chief State School Officers, is comprised of teams of state and local leaders from Arkansas, California, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Oregon, and Washington and works to connect education improvement efforts with other human service reforms, economic development, and community-building initiatives. This document compiles selected presentations from an "Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network" conference held in September of 1999. The focus of this conference was on innovations in early childhood education, programs to better address the needs of youth, and approaches to increasing school safety. Conference papers contained in this document are: (1) "Building Early Childhood Education Infrastructure and Coordination: The Smart Start Experience" (Karen Ponder); (2) "Using Title I and Local Funds To Build Quality Preschool Programs in Charlotte-Mecklenburg: A 'Bright Beginning'" (Anthony F. Bucci); (3) "Assessing the Effectiveness of Preschool Programs in Kentucky" (Kim F. Townley); (4) "The Missouri School Entry Assessment Project" (Sharon Ford Schattgen); (5) "Interventions To Prevent and Reduce Antisocial Behavior and Promote Prosocial Behavior" (Steven Asher); (6) "Project Learn: Making the After-School Hours Work for Boys & Girls Club Members" (Carter J. Savage); (7) "The Talent Development Model" (Bonnie Erickson); (8) "Developmental Assets: Identifying the Building Blocks of Healthy Development that Young People Need To Grow Up To Be Healthy, Caring, and Responsible" (Judy Taccogna); (9) "The National Collaborative on Violence Prevention" (Linda K. Bowen); (10) "Kentucky's Response to Safe Schools" (Lois Adams-Rodgers); (11) "Arkansas' Initiatives To Prevent Youth Violence" (J. B. Robertson); and (12) "Buckner Alternative

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

High School" (Blake Haselton). Two appendices contain the conference agenda and the presenters' biographies. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 302

Current State and Local Initiatives to Support Student Learning:

Early Childhood Programs and Innovative Programs to Better Address the Needs of Youth

Selected Presentations from an
Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network
Conference

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

September 12-15, 1999

Louisville, Kentucky

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Buterbaugh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

PS 030452

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council of Chief State School Officers

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide, nonprofit organization composed of the public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO seeks its members' consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public. Through its structure of standing and special committees, the Council responds to a broad range of concerns about education and provides leadership on major education issues.

Because the Council represents the chief education administrators, it has access to the educational and governmental establishment in each state and to the national influence that accompanies this unique position. CCSSO forms coalitions with many other education organizations and is able to provide leadership for a variety of policy concerns that affect elementary and secondary education. Thus, CCSSO members are able to act cooperatively on matters vital to the education of America's young people.

CCSSO's Resource Center on Educational Equity

The CCSSO Resource Center on Educational Equity provides services designed to achieve equity and high quality in education for minorities, women and girls, students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, and low-income students. The Center is responsible for managing and staffing a variety of CCSSO leadership initiatives to ensure educational success for all children and youth, especially those placed at risk.

Council of Chief State School Officers
Nancy Keenan (Montana), President
Peter McWalters (Rhode Island), President-Elect
Suellen Reed (Indiana), Vice President

Gordon M. Ambach, Executive Director

Cynthia G. Brown, Director
Resource Center on Educational Equity
Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001-1431
202-408-5505
Fax: 202-408-8072
www.ccsso.org

Publication date: July, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 3

Introduction 4

Presentations

I. Innovations in Early Childhood Education

Building Early Childhood Education Infrastructure and Coordination: The Smart Start Experience
Karen Ponder, Director, North Carolina Partnership for Children 7

Using Title I and Local Funds to Build Quality Preschool Programs in Charlotte-Mecklenburg: A "Bright Beginning"
Anthony F. Bucci, Title I Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., Schools 12

Assessing the Effectiveness of Preschool Programs in Kentucky
Kim F. Townley, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development 18

The Missouri School Entry Assessment Project
Sharon Ford Schattgen, Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education 23

II. Innovative Programs to Better Address the Needs of Youth

Interventions to Prevent and Reduce Antisocial Behavior and Promote Prosocial Behavior
Steven Asher, Professor of Psychology, Duke University 28

Project Learn: Making the After-School Hours Work for Boys & Girls Club Members
Carter J. Savage, Senior Director, Education Programs, Boys & Girls Clubs of America 37

The Talent Development Model
Bonnie Erickson, Consultant, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University 45

Developmental Assets: Identifying the Building Blocks of Healthy Development that Young People Need to Grow Up to be Healthy, Caring, and Responsible
Judy Taccogna, Director, Education Sector, Search Institute 54

III. Increasing School Safety and Preventing Youth Violence
The National Collaborative on Violence Prevention
Linda K. Bowen, Executive Director, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention 58

Kentucky's Response to Safe Schools
Lois Adams-Rodgers, Director, Kentucky Center for School Safety 64

Arkansas' Initiatives to Prevent Youth Violence
J.B. Robertson, Field Services Specialist/Guidance, Arkansas Department of Education 67

Buckner Alternative High School
Blake Haselton, Chairman, Board of Directors, Kentucky Center for School Safety, and Superintendent, Oldham County Schools, Kentucky 72

Appendix A
Conference Agenda

Appendix B
Presenters' Biographies

Acknowledgments

We extend our gratitude to the many people who contributed to the conference of the *Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network* held in Louisville, September 15-18, 1999. We also appreciate the efforts of the individuals who contributed to these conference proceedings.

We are especially grateful to the conference speakers whose presentations are included in this document. Their knowledge, experience, and insights were of great value to those who attended the Network conference and should prove useful to those who read these proceedings as well. The *Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network* is co-directed by Cynthia Brown and Burton Taylor of CCSSO's Resource Center on Educational Equity. Mr. Taylor prepared and edited this document with the assistance of Barbara West and Lee Jernstadt.

Lastly, we wish to thank the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Stuart Foundation for their generous support of the Network. The opinions expressed in the following papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the foundations.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1994, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has administered the Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network, which currently is funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Stuart Foundation. The Network is comprised of teams of state and local leaders from seven states – Arkansas, California, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Oregon, and Washington. These teams are working to connect education improvement efforts with other human service reforms, economic development, and community-building initiatives. Through Network activities, CCSSO assists the state teams in making steady progress in thinking about and acting upon the connections that need to be made across education and human services systems in order to ensure that all children learn at high levels and that the families and communities in which our most disadvantaged children live are strengthened.

The primary Network activity is periodic team meetings, which usually are conducted semiannually. Through these meetings, team members are introduced to new ideas and strategies by researches and practitioners and can then apply these ideas in their home arenas. Also, the team meetings provide a rare opportunity to maintain an ongoing conversation and engage in peer learning that spans the education and human service systems and brings together representatives from different levels of government and the private sector. With this forum for sharing lessons across states, state teams can think critically about and plan actions for building broad partnerships that address pressing policy concerns, such as improving the quality of education and assuring economic opportunities for families.

Network meetings also foster collaboration by providing an environment in which new members can get to know their counterparts in an informal setting and familiarize themselves with their own state and community initiatives. Spending time with other state team members and learning about what is being tried in other states helps newer participants think creatively about the roles they and their agencies or organizations can play to improve results for children and their families.

From September 15 through 18, 1999, the *Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration Network* met in Louisville Kentucky, to examine and discuss early childhood education initiatives, approaches to increasing school safety, and programs to better address the needs of youth. These topics were selected by the state teams to support current, high-priority work on these issues in their states and communities. With respect to early childhood education, participants focused on North Carolina's and Kentucky's accomplishments and plans, as well as how the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools used innovative techniques to develop the resources necessary to build a high-quality preschool program. Participants looked at school safety from several perspectives -- the research findings and recommendations of psychologists who have studied children who manifest behavioral problems, practitioners who have developed and implemented programs to provide environments in which children and youth can thrive, and programs designed specifically to address and prevent youth violence. In general, we have organized this document to conform to the sequence of the presentations at the conference. However, we made some adjustments to

include related presentations in the same section. A copy of the conference agenda is included at Appendix A. We were privileged to have a number of distinguished presenters. Their biographies are included at Appendix B.

The purpose of this publication is to share with a wider audience the information and insights team members benefitted from during four exciting days. We hope the remarks that follow -- only some of which were originally prepared in writing -- will be as useful and provocative to our readers as they were to the team members who joined us in Louisville in September, 1999.

I. Innovations in Early Childhood Education

Building Early Childhood Education Infrastructure and Coordination: The Smart Start Experience

Karen Ponder, Director, North Carolina Partnership for Children

Six years ago Smart Start was just a vision in North Carolina. Some thought it was an impossible dream. We had the worst child care standards in the nation and we were near the bottom in almost every category that relates to child well-being. Fortunately, Governor Jim Hunt was ready to assemble a team to tackle these issues and send a very strong message that children and education were going to be the number one priority in North Carolina.

We knew that if we were going to fulfill our dream, business as usual could not continue and everyone involved with the health and well-being of young children would need to be key participants. We launched our Smart Start effort in a very short period and named the first counties to receive funding. Today, Smart Start has successfully expanded to all 100 counties in the state, at a funding level of $218 million in state dollars. These are new state funds, not taken from other programs. Currently, we are touching thousands of lives every day and the impact is exceeding our own expectations.

What Is Smart Start?

Smart Start is a comprehensive public-private initiative to help all North Carolina children enter school healthy and ready to succeed. Smart Start programs and services provide children under age six with access to high-quality and affordable child care, health care, and other critical family services. Smart Start reaches children during the most critical years of development. Our goal is to ensure that every child in North Carolina has the opportunity for a brighter future.

Smart Start provides a mechanism for planning and funding that allows agencies to connect and communicate among each other on behalf of young children. Barriers are replaced with new ways of doing business. The early childhood system has changed in North Carolina because of our collaborative efforts and early results.

In North Carolina, education is no longer considered to begin at kindergarten or even at age four; it is now considered to begin at birth. Smart Start is improving the quality of child care. This is one of our major concerns because in North Carolina, 70 percent of mothers with children under age six work outside the home.

There also is a state pilot effort underway to ensure that children receive the dental care they need. This is one of our major health problems in young children. Such state level efforts could not have happened nearly this quickly without Smart Start to build the base.

Staffing and Program Ratings

Because of Smart Start, more early childhood teachers are getting the education they need and better compensation for their work. According to the North Carolina teacher education performance standard, every early childhood teacher, regardless of the setting, should have at least a two-year college degree. We have made amazing progress toward this goal. Various counties have approached the situation differently. In one county, the percentage of teachers with at least a two-year degree has increased from five percent to 90 percent. It is astonishing what you can do when community colleges and universities work together with the early childhood community. Also, a benefits and compensation program for early childhood teachers is now available statewide.

Since the initiative commenced, an unprecedented five-star rating system is being implemented. This is a consumer-driven system, allowing parents to know and demand higher quality based on the rating of the center or other provider.

Results

Studies of Smart Start indicate that we are significantly improving the quality of child care, and that children who participate in Smart Start enter school better prepared for success. Since Smart Start began in 1993:

- 40,855 new child care spaces have been created.
- 82,352 children have received child care subsidies so their parents can work.
- 206,659 children have received early intervention and preventive health screenings, like dental, vision, and hearing exams.
- 190,961 children have received higher quality care, thanks to Smart Start quality improvements.
- 135,139 parents have received parent and health education through a variety of Smart Start-supported activities, like family resource centers.
- North Carolina's child-care teacher turnover rate dropped from 42 percent in 1993 to 31 percent in 1998. This decrease can be attributed to the improvement in wage supplement programs and funding from Smart Start.

Moreover, a September 1999 study found that Smart Start programs help boost children's thinking and language skills when compared to children who are not connected with the program. The study also concluded that efforts need to be directly related to improving the quality of child care if they are going to have a direct effect on school entry skills.

Factors for Success

We know there are no quick solutions to improving child outcomes. Time, money and intensity of services are needed to solve the problems that prevent children from achieving at high levels. You cannot effect system-wide change by focusing on a single strategy. There are several key

factors that I believe are vital to the success of this kind of effort:

1. *The effort must be comprehensive and focused on all children.* At first, our effort was seen as a strategy for "poor children." In order to get everyone's support and engagement, we found you need to focus on all children. Some children need one set of services, some need another; some need intense services, some need less intense ones. But every child needs something to be prepared for school.

2. *Plan comprehensively.* Time is needed to plan. We had little time in the beginning to plan all the details and logistics this kind of an effort requires. We jumped on a moving train or, as we often describe it, we built the plane as we were flying it. In retrospect, we could have had more things in order if there had been more time to plan before we launched the program. I would encourage other states to take time to plan and to build accountability measures into your plan. But do not take so much time that you miss the opportunity to successfully launch the program. North Carolina had a champion and a great opportunity to move forward, so we seized the moment. Timing is critical. Once you see the right moment, take advantage of it.

3. *Collaboration is the key.* Form community partnerships. Everyone stands to benefit from the implementation of this kind of an early childhood initiative. Our major businesses know that Smart Start is a wise investment and it contributes to a brighter future for the state's economy. Because of that, North Carolina businesses have given over $50 million in cash and services to the program. They are involved in many ways other than funding as well. For example, major banks and other industries have donated volunteer time to this effort.

   Faith communities were a critical part of our development. The only early opposition to Smart Start was from churches who felt that our message was that every child should be in child care. We dealt with that misunderstanding by including the faith community in our local planning efforts. They are a natural audience because faith communities support strong families and can be great partners.

   Parents are beginning to demand a higher quality child care for young children. They, too, are critical partners.

   Public schools are at the table in North Carolina. They know the value of school readiness when children enter kindergarten. Our efforts are linked together. Actually, Smart Start money can be used to support pre-kindergarten programs in public schools, as well as in other ways that local communities decide upon.

   I cannot overstate how important it has been to the success of our effort to bring everyone to the table.

4. *Educate the community.* You must also educate the community. The public must understand that preparing a child for school success begins at birth. We used an interesting approach to educate and create awareness as part of our effort. We started fast; we got results. Then we used those early results to educate the community and tied it into brain research and other things about early education that are important for people to know. Some people start with a big education campaign and then build their efforts from there. We are six years out, and just beginning to develop a "Champions for Children Campaign" that will be our public awareness campaign over the next year. Because our governor will be ending his term soon and he has been such a champion for this program, we feel the need to increase our efforts to sustain Smart Start in the next administration. We have a lot
to do to create and maintain public awareness of the program. We believe it was a good strategy to get early results and then use those results to promote continuance and expansion of the program.

5. *There must be a champion or champions to keep this kind of an early childhood effort at the top of your state's agenda.* Any time you take on such a major initiative, you must have a high-level person with a lot of visibility supporting your cause. It does not have to be the governor. In Colorado, the effort was led by a business person. Whoever the champion is, he or she has to say, "children are important, children are important, children are important," and continue to say that regardless of the pressure to do other things.

6. *Politics matter.* Because North Carolina's effort was launched by Governor Hunt, it became the focus of political campaigns across the state. Interestingly, in the last legislative campaign, there were actually incumbents who lost their races for opposing the expansion of Smart Start. The lesson learned was never to underestimate how political a program can become, particularly when you are trying to get public funding for it. We have moved past this by making Smart Start available to all counties because, if all are involved, politically it is looked at very differently.

Conclusion

A new course for early childhood education has been charted in North Carolina and we are committed to making sure that all children in our state have access to the programs and services they need. I believe it is urgent for other states to continue moving forward to implement early childhood education initiatives.

I will end with a quote: "What is urgent takes priority over what is merely important, so that what is important will be attended to only when it becomes urgent, which may be too late." -

Louis J. Halle.

Using Title I and Local Funds to Build Quality Preschool Programs in Charlotte-Mecklenburg: A "Bright Beginning"

Anthony F. Bucci, Title I Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

"Children fortunate enough to attend a high-quality preschool ... and who enter the primary grades with adequate preparation have a better chance of achieving to high levels than those who do not ..."

Years of Promise
Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1996

"All children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool ..."Goal 1: Ready to Learn–National Education Goals

In 1996, Charlotte-Mecklenburg's new superintendent, Dr. Eric J. Smith, shared his vision with the district and the community regarding student achievement. A key element of that vision, and its derived goals, included an expanded, literacy-focused, Title I-supported pre-kindergarten program. The superintendent created a District Committee on pre-kindergarten and charged the Committee with developing a plan to significantly expand pre-kindergarten by shifting Title I funds, beginning with the 1997-98 year. The result of this initiative was Bright Beginnings -- a program for four-year old children that is funded almost entirely with Title I funds.

Before I describe Bright Beginnings, let me tell you a little about the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS). The district is located in the southern Piedmont region of North Carolina and is the 23rd largest school district in the United States, up from 25th the previous year. There were 103,000 students when we opened in fall, 1999. The poverty rate is approximately 36 percent and
minorities comprise 49.2 percent of the student body. Our minority population is becoming more diverse. For example, the Hispanic population has increased about 150 percent in the last two years.

Chapter 1/Title I had always been the major vehicle for funding pre-kindergarten in CMS. However, historically it was a relatively small portion of the Title I budget (approximately 12 percent). The CMS Title I program followed a somewhat typical model of serving a large number of schools. Since 1992, there has been a focus on early intervention through Title I support. It has provided services to approximately 45 elementary schools through schoolwide support, Reading Recovery, and pre-kindergarten programs.

Bright Beginnings Funding and Expanded Resources

In 1997, CMS undertook a significant expansion of pre-kindergarten that resulted in eliminating Title I support for all schools except for those whose poverty level exceeded 75 percent. CMS now uses approximately 85 percent of its Title I grant to fund almost 85 percent of the pre-kindergarten program. The rest of the support for the program is obtained through collaborative efforts and local sources. The program costs us over $10 million annually. About $8.2 million

of that comes from Title I. Schools that previously had Title I support are now provided extra support through the district's "Differentiated Staffing" plan. Under this plan, schools receive additional locally supported teaching staff based on their poverty level. Thus, no school previously receiving Title I support lost services as a result of shifting the majority of the Title I funding to the pre-kindergarten level.

The following chart shows the significance of the expansion from one year to the next:

1996-97

- 400 students
- 23 classrooms
- 1 center
- A general curriculum framework
- Parent involvement

1997-98

- 1850 students
- 94 classrooms
- 3 centers
  - A written, taught, tested curriculum
- Family-school partnerships with a parent compact

We have three school buildings that are dedicated pre-kindergarten centers. The space crunch in CMS is beyond description. We opened, on average, three new school buildings a year in the 1990s. Yet, we still found three buildings to dedicate to our pre-kindergarten program. (I will tell you how one of those buildings came to be when I get into the collaborative piece.) In addition, we have school-based sites that each have four or five pre-kindergarten classrooms. Also, we have collaborations with corporate and community partners -- a crucial component of the program.

Essential Program Components

Beyond its size, the significance and uniqueness of the CMS Bright Beginnings Program lies in its "non-negotiable" components:

- A child-centered curriculum with strong focus on language development and emergent literacy
- Professional development
- Ongoing research and evaluation
- Strong parent participation
- Parent/family involvement and partnerships
- Community partnerships
- Community participation and collaboration

These non-negotiable components provide a district-wide framework for pre-kindergarten curriculum and instruction, as well as for adult participation and expectations.

Why Do We Have This Program?

Approximately three years ago, we looked at school district data. Poverty, student achievement, and minority achievement data showed a clear need for the program. Because we use Title I money for this program, we serve children who have a demonstrated educational need, as specified in the Title I policy guidance for pre- kindergarten programs. We screen children for the

purpose of determining educational need. To demonstrate how dramatic this need is, I will take just three items from the screening instrument and show you the gap between children who do not need the program (ineligible children) and those who do (eligible children):

	Eligible Children	Ineligible Children
• Counts to 4:	14.7%	53.6%
• Knows a triangle	36.6%	78.5%
• Knows the letter "S"	12.5%	46.4%

To say this gap is dramatic does not begin to describe the need. We serve just under 2,000 students. Twelve school districts in North Carolina have fewer than 2,000 students. (That number becomes especially impressive when you understand that North Carolina has only 117 school districts.) We have 102 classrooms and serve an average of 19 children per classroom. Some of those classrooms are Head Start collaborative classrooms, in which Title I pays for the teacher and Head Start pays for the teacher assistant, thus ensuring a certified teacher in each of the Head Start classrooms.

What is Bright Beginnings?

"Bright Beginnings" is a child-centered program, with a strong focus on language development and emergent literacy. It employs a required, literacy-rich, written curriculum, while simultaneously providing key experiences that lay the foundation for early school success. The curriculum is informed by research on emergent literacy and language learning. It contains developmental objectives, pre-kindergarten literacy benchmarks, content standards, and performance expectations derived from and aligned with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study. The centerpiece of the curriculum is the unit. Unit components include thematic connections, content maps, unit books and emergent books, curriculum "book webs," concept maps, literacy lessons, center activities, and family activities.

As noted above, guiding principles inform decisions about literacy and language, instruction, assessment, family-school partnerships, and professional development. For example, literacy activities are embedded within the framework of a developmentally appropriate curriculum. Assessment is ongoing and continuous, and relies on appropriate and typical classroom activities.

With regard to professional development, CMS requires that every pre-kindergarten teacher be certified to teach in this setting. We have in North Carolina a birth-through-kindergarten certification (BK). Every teacher in the program is either currently BK certified or provisionally certified. Title I pays for the graduate work necessary to qualify for BK certification. In effect, we have a career ladder. There are teaching assistants in the program who have an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree. We help them work towards finishing the courses they need to qualify for certification.

Bright Beginnings is not a stand-alone program. It is linked to the district's academic achievement goals, called Goals 2001. The first academic achievement goal is that at least 85 percent of third graders will be reading at or above grade level by the end of 2001. This program

is part of a pre-kindergarten-3 continuum of effort to help us achieve that goal.

With regard to the curriculum, we had a tough time in the first two years of this program getting some people to stop calling it a reading program for four-year-olds. That is not what it is. The curriculum is aligned with the state curriculum, called the Standard Course of Study (SCOS). The SCOS is what students are tested on in grades 3 through 12.

The instructional units are the heart of the curriculum. They are quite comprehensive and they are integrated. We think they are a strong model of what a good unit at any grade level should be.
We believe in what is called the "seamless web," in which curriculum, instruction and assessment
are integrated and implemented in an ongoing way.

Because we use Title I funds as the key funding component of this program, we adhere to the Title I requirement of using multiple assessments to look at student performance at any level. We
have adapted the High Scope Child Observation Record (COR). It is a largely anecdotal record that teachers keep on kids. Also, we use Concepts About Print (CAP), e.g., the ability to read left to right and top to bottom, and upper-case letter identification.

Initial Results

At the end of the first year of the program, student achievement exceeded expectations on all three measurements. On the COR, the expected score was 40, and the observed end-of-year mean score was 45.10. The expected score on the CAP was 7, and the end-of-year mean was 9.48. Because there was no agreement on the number of letters of the alphabet children should be able to identify (proposals ranged from 4 to 26), no expected score was identified. There was,
however, an unofficial expectation of 10 letters. The observed end-of-year mean was 18.76.

The level of parent participation and collaboration in Bright Beginnings is beyond anything I have seen in any of the schools where we have tried to involve parents. In fact, some elementary school personnel have asked us what we "did with" those pre-kindergarten parents. They are coming in as kindergarten parents as activists in their elementary schools. We thought that was a tremendous testimony in light of the demographics of the population being served by the program. We have very young parents; their average age is 22.

Collaboration With the Corporate Community and Other Partners

I want to share a story about partnerships with the corporate community. About two and a half years ago another director and I were told to visit a school that was being considered as a pre-kindergarten site. Except for a very small segment, the school had been closed for about 25 years. That segment had remained open as a community center in a neighborhood that had nothing. We were asked to take a look at it and make a recommendation as to what we needed to do to make it ready for pre-kindergarten. We recommended that it be bulldozed. The design of the building was a "Florida plan." It had no hallways and all classrooms exited to the outdoors.

A lot of shortcuts were taken with that kind of construction. There was a pedestrian bridge linking two of the wings that ran over what once was a creek -- Charlotte has almost as many creeks as it has people -- and is now a dry creek bed. We could not cross the bridge because there were huge holes in its floor. Windows were broken. The cafeteria probably had 30 coats of paint over the windows and they were covered with bars. It was just beyond my imagination as to how that building could be rehabilitated.

Thankfully, others had a lot more imagination. In February, the superintendent said we were going to open the building in August. Nations Bank, now Bank of America, said they would help us get it ready. They lent a team of architects and a project manager to work with our building services staff. By the third Monday in August, that building was not only open, it was an inviting, attractive place. It was absolutely incredible. This is one example of the corporate community coming in and helping us out in a very deliberate, hands-on, intensive way.

Charlotte is the second largest financial center in the country, second only to New York. First Union Bank, also headquartered in Charlotte, is the sixth largest bank in the country. It allows any employee to voluntarily take an hour off each week to spend time with kids in school. It can be the employee's own child or another child the employee would like to mentor. In particular, First Union extended that option for the pre-kindergarten program. We have First Union employees coming in as lunch buddies for pre-K kids. We have them coming in daily, every week, to every classroom, to read to a child and then to donate the book to the classroom. This is a tremendous investment of both time and human capital.

There are many other examples of corporate and community support. As you may know, the Knight Foundation funds literacy efforts. Knight Ridder, the parent company of the *Charlotte Observer,* and the Knight Foundation funded a family literacy program called FAST -- Families and Schools Together.

The faith community has been a very strong partner. Project Uplift is a school district initiative that works with the families of children, birth through age three, as part of a collaborative effort.

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte works with us on the professional development components that I mentioned earlier. They bring the classes to us. They design the courses with us to make sure that we are meeting certification requirements. Central Piedmont Community College also does a lot of work with our families.

Conclusion

The advantages of Bright Beginnings are:

- A literacy and language development focus
- A fully-developed, written curriculum
- Clearly defined program standards
- A curriculum-integrated parent component
- Appropriately trained and certified teachers

- Proven program planning and implementation
- Flexibility
- Proven ability to prepare children to learn

Bright Beginnings has been successful because it has:

- A written, taught, and tested curriculum
- Strong parent participation
- Integrated professional development
- Vibrant community collaboration
- On-going research and evaluation
- Significant commitment of federal and local funds
- Supportive leadership from the Board of Education and senior staff

"Building Dreams" is the theme of the school district. We believe that Bright Beginnings is a catalyst for helping build those dreams. It opens doors for poor and educationally disadvantaged children. The metaphor of doors opened or closed is tremendously powerful when you think about the many ways a "door" is open or closed in our lives. Our ultimate goal is to serve 4,000 kids in this program. Title I funds are nearly at their limit in providing support for this program. We have been level-funded for almost three years now. So we will begin looking at additional collaborative efforts -- public and private -- to help us obtain the support we need to achieve this goal.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Preschool Programs in Kentucky and Planning to Implement a New Early Childhood Initiative

Kim F. Townley, Executive Director
Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development

In 1990, Kentucky started down the path of education reform. First, we addressed elementary and secondary education. Yesterday you had the opportunity to visit one of the innovative parts of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) – Family Resource Centers and Youth Service Centers. Another important element of KERA is the Preschool Program. I want to tell you about that program and how it might differ from others, either in your states or from the one that we heard about in North Carolina. Then I will share with you information about the Governor's Early Childhood Initiative.

Overview of the Current Program

Our four-year-old Preschool Program is not universal. It is for 4-year-old children who are at risk and for 3- and 4-year-old children with disabilities. In Kentucky, we have defined "at-risk" children as children who are eligible for free lunch. Four-year-old children who are eligible for free lunch can participate in the program on a voluntary basis. It is an inclusive program in that children with disabilities are in the same early childhood classrooms as other at-risk children.

To help ensure that we have quality instruction in this program, we have a new teacher certification area, Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education, which includes two disciplines, early childhood education and early childhood special education. We are training teachers to serve both populations of children in a group setting. It is a birth-through-age 5 certification, and we expect that teachers will be working with children -- with and without disabilities -- in several different venues, such as home visiting programs, private sector programs, public schools, and Head Start programs.

Program Evaluation

The legislature passed KERA in April, 1990, and all school systems were told that they would `have early childhood programs for 4-year-old children in operation by the following August. We had a very short amount of time to get things up and running.

The state education department had the foresight to include an evaluation component from the beginning. We began our evaluation in the spring of 1991 and have continued it to the present. We have followed, assessed, and tested more than 3,500 children. The children we began with now are in the fifth and sixth grades. We have used a multi-pronged approach in assessing these children.

A question you have heard discussed today is, "What is a developmentally appropriate assessment of young children?" We have struggled with that question from the outset of the program. We knew that funders and legislators were going to want to see pre- and post-

program test results. We tried to come up with the most developmentally appropriate assessment that included social skills and problem-solving behaviors, as well as academics.

As these children have moved through the school system, we have moved with them. We have asked parents as well as teachers to assess their children's progress. We have examined how children progress in the program, what kinds of transitions they make into kindergarten, and the extent to which they maintain their progress over the years. We have looked at the children over time to see what kind of improvements they have made.

Evaluation Findings

Our findings are set forth in several reports. Some of the results are significant.

Children at risk and children with disabilities made significant progress across developmental domains during the years that they were in the preschool program. They made gains, but they had further to go than those who were not at risk or disabled. Some of their progress is significantly better than that of their at-risk peers. Children who attended the preschool
program were rated by their teachers as being ready for kindergarten at the same rate as their peers from higher income families.

One of the criticisms of our research effort has been that we do not have a control group. Kentucky has done such a wonderful job of enrolling children in programs, we cannot find an appropriate control group. It was suggested that we go to other states to identify a control group, but we decided that was not appropriate or economically feasible. Short of going door-to-door or sitting at the health department to find a control group, we could not identify one. Also, we had an ethical dilemma. If we identified a child who was eligible for the preschool program, we felt that we had an obligation to tell the parents about the availability of the program and enroll the child, thereby losing a potential control group member. Consequently, as preschool children entered the public schools, we identified a comparison group. These were children of the same age as program participants who were eligible to participate in the program but did not. We also evaluated children who were not eligible to participate in the program.

What we see repeatedly in our research is that the children who were not eligible to participate because they were above the income guidelines do better in academics, social skills, and problem-solving behaviors. The group that consistently comes in second-best is comprised of the children who were eligible and did participate in the program. There is a significant difference between the children who were eligible and did participate, and the children who were eligible and did not participate. We know that participation in the Kentucky Preschool Program narrows the gap, but these children still are not achieving at age-appropriate levels.

Importantly, this progress seems to be maintained over the years. Children in the program continue to do as well as their peers in both social and academic skills through the fifth grade. The program is making a difference as the children make the transition into school, and the results seem to be lasting at least as far as we have followed the children, through the fifth grade.

The Governor's Early Childhood Initiative -- More Needs To Be Done

In January, 1999, I came to the Governor's office to head up his Early Childhood Initiative. Governor Patton recognized that while we were making some progress in improving ~~in~~ early childhood education, much more needs to be done. I want to give you some background about the Governor and the reasons for his initiative. The Governor is an avid reader. He has read information about brain research and he believes in it. Many of you may have seen a Pet Scan that shows the healthy brain at age 3 and the brain of a neglected child at age 3. Governor Patton has said that he wants every child in the state of Kentucky to have a brain that is healthy by this age.

The Governor sees the need for greater emphasis on early childhood education as an economic development issue as well as a moral one. In 1945, there were 46 people contributing to Social Security for every one person who was drawing payments. A short five years later, there were only 16 people paying into the system for each person who was drawing payments. In 1992, that ratio was 3 to 1. We are about to do a flip-flop; soon there will be three retired people for every one person who is working.

This is an economic development issue. We must have a workforce comprised of taxpayers, not tax users. If we want to attract and recruit quality industry into the state, we have to develop a high-quality workforce. Because of that imperative, Kentucky cannot afford to leave one child behind. Every child needs to reach his or her full potential. Thus, the Governor sees the early childhood years, birth through 5, as the next logical focus in education reform.

As Karen Ponder said , "Education does not begin when you cross the school room door. Education begins when you enter this world." The case could be made that it begins even sooner. Last year, Kentucky ranked 39th in the *Kids Count Report*, and this year we fell to 41st. We are not proud of this. We think this is an additional reason why we must address early childhood in this state.

The Governor's Approach

The Governor said we must have a coordinated effort; so he has done several things simultaneously. He established an early childhood development office within the Governor's Office. In part, this office serves as a vehicle to obtain input and support for early childhood policy from several constituencies in addition to the education sector. We have been working with a 25-member task force that the Governor appointed. It includes six legislators and seven members of the executive branch, such as the Commissioner of Education and secretaries of the cabinets for Families and Children, Workforce Development and Health Services. In addition to policymakers, we have six business and labor leaders on the task force. We also have included higher education officials and members of the judiciary.

We asked the task force members to commit a substantial amount of time for a limited period. This broad-based group has been meeting on a regular basis. They met on a monthly basis for several months. In the last three months, they have met for a full day, twice a month, to help craft the 20-year plan that Governor Patton has asked us to develop.

Areas of Inquiry for the Task Force

In formulating recommendations for the Governor, we have investigated a variety of issues, including:

- **Pre- and post-natal care** – We have looked at the environments in which children spend large amounts of time and methods to help families to improve those environments. The first environment in which children spend a large amount of time is pre-natal. How do we support families so that babies are born in the best possible condition? Kentucky has the highest rate of neuro-tube defects in the United States. It is twice the national average. What can we do to reduce that rate? What can we do to make sure that the number of low-birth-weight babies goes down? These rates have not decreased in 30 years. We have made progress in other areas, but we must get newborn children delivered in the healthiest condition possible. If we do not want to view this as a moral issue, we can view it as an economic one. We can save tax dollars by bringing babies into the world healthy. We have also looked at what happens to children after they go home from the hospital. How do we support families in that environment and what can we do to help improve it?

- **Family literacy** -- I am sure all of you have told parents that they should read to their children every day. But it is hard to read to your child when you cannot read yourself. Therefore, family literacy is an issue we must address.

- **Early care services** -- In Kentucky, 62 percent of women who have children under age 5 work outside the home. We have looked at early-care programs for children birth to age 5. Children who enter the child care system at 5 or 6 weeks of age and stay in that system until they go to public school at 5 years of age spend more time in the child care system than they will in public school, grades K through 12. These children are spending 10 to 12 hours a day in child care. Unfortunately, most of it is not good quality child care. We need to develop ways to improve the quality of this care.

- **Before- and after-school programs** -- Children who have good quality before- and after-school programs become pregnant less often, smoke less, and are referred to juvenile court systems less. Yet it is commonplace for children to spend large amounts of time without receiving proper stimulation. It is important to ensure that once children enter public schools, the time they spend out of school is not neglected.

- **Improving the quality of early childhood teachers** -- Education reform is dealing with the hours spent in school, but what about that other time? As Tony Bucci has said, we know that professional development is incredibly important. Karen Ponder also talked about it. We in Kentucky have a huge gap to address in this area. To be a teacher in a child care center in Kentucky, a person is only required to be 18, free of tuberculosis, and able to pass a criminal records check. All of you know how important consistency is for

young children. In early childhood education the teacher turnover rate is between 31 percent and 45 percent. This rate alone has a negative effect on providing a quality environment. Children are not getting what they need because of that high turnover. In comparison, turnover among public school teachers is just 6 percent. We are not recruiting qualified people for early childhood education, we are not training them, and we are not paying an adequate wage to retain them. We need to provide early childhood teachers with adequate compensation and a seamless system of professional development, beginning at the entry level and extending through the masters degree level.

In pursuing this inquiry, we have undertaken a grassroots effort to get citizen input. We have conducted focus groups across the state. In ten sessions, we asked people to tell us what is working, where the gaps are, and how they would solve the problems they identified. People have been very creative. One thing that everybody agrees upon is that early education of parents is critically important. At one of the forums, we were told to give parents a state tax credit for participating in parent education programs. I asked how this participation could be documented. The answer was to attach a completion form to the tax return. People in the community have been thinking creatively about how problems might be addressed.

We are in the process of completing the work discussed above. The task force has been presented with more than 300 recommendations. Our blessing and our curse is that we have had a very ambitious and agreeable task force. They want to do everything and they want to do it now. It is very difficult to say now what are we going to be doing in 20 years. On one hand, the consensus has been very nice, but on the other hand, it makes it hard to write a report. We plan to give the report to the Governor in November, 1999. Then we will be drafting legislation for the General Assembly in the 2000 session.

Conclusion

There is a cartoon that I cut out of a newspaper years ago, and unfortunately it is still applicable. Several children are walking down the street and one says, "Adults say they can't afford to help us now. Well, they'll pay later." That is the whole message behind any early childhood initiative in any state: You pay now or you pay later. You pay for a good quality early childhood program now, or you pay for a remedial program education later. Worse, you also pay for juvenile justice halls, juvenile detention centers, and prisons. It is much cheaper and makes much more sense to invest in children early on.

The Missouri School Entry Assessment Project

Sharon Ford Schattgen, Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

What is the Missouri School Entry Assessment Project?

The Missouri School Entry Assessment Project (SEAP) is part of the work of the Governor's Show Me Results Early Childhood Education Interagency Team. The team is composed of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education , the Department of Health, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Social Services, and the Department of Public Safety. The team was charged with creating and implementing a strategic plan to ensure that "all children enter school ready to succeed."

SEAP is a comprehensive effort to gather information on the school readiness of children as they enter kindergarten in Missouri public schools. The results of the study will be used by the team and other policymakers to improve educational, social, and health services to young children and their families.

Study Methodology

The study, coordinated by the Project Construct National Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia and conducted in the fall of 1998 by Research and Training Associates of Overland Park, Kansas, involved 3,500 kindergarten children from a stratified random sample of Missouri districts and schools. Kindergarten teachers were trained to rate children's preparation for kindergarten using a School Entry Profile. The instrument consisted of 65 items that reflect important entry-level skills, knowledge, behaviors or dispositions in seven areas of development. Additionally, more than 3,100 parents completed a Parent/Guardian Survey about their children. This survey provides important data about children's health, education, and literacy experiences prior to kindergarten.

Study Content

The School Entry Profile was organized around seven conceptual areas that the expert panel agreed reflect important dimensions of school readiness and build upon prior psychometric work in observational assessments in kindergarten. Conceptual areas and items measuring these areas were reviewed with the understanding that the skills and behaviors could be reliably observed within the beginning weeks of a school year. However, teachers were requested to provide at least a month for children to get accustomed to their new surroundings and to the teacher. The areas identified include:

- symbolic development
- communication
- mathematical/physical knowledge
- working with others
- learning to learn
- physical development
- conventional knowledge

Items for the symbolic development, communication, mathematical/physical knowledge, working with others, and learning to learn domains were assessed with a three-point scale: "almost always," "occasionally/sometimes," and "not yet/almost never." Items comprising the physical development and conventional knowledge domains were scored "yes" or "no."

Sixty-five items were either obtained from a previously developed instrument or were newly developed to reflect important kindergarten entry-level skills, knowledge, behaviors, or dispositions. However, it must be noted that items do not measure the entirety of what should be learned prior to kindergarten and are, thus, not appropriate for a pre-test/post-test kindergarten evaluation design.

What is the "Parents as Teachers" Program?

As described in the section below, participation in one program, Parents as Teachers (PAT), resulted in a significantly higher degree of school readiness for high-poverty children during the first year of the project's operation. PAT is a home-school-community partnership that supports parents in their role as their children's first and most influential teachers. The state provides funds to public school districts for this program under Missouri's Early Childhood Development Act. These funds are used to implement developmental screenings and for parent education. Children are screened in the areas of language, motor, health/physical development, and sensory functioning. Services may be offered anytime during the year. Parent education services are delivered through a combination of small group meetings with parents of similarly-aged children and personalized private visits.

Programs must operate for at least eight months of each year. Participation in screening and parent education is voluntary on the part of parents. All public school districts are required to offer services. Districts may contract for services with other public or private not-for-profit agencies that have programs approved by the Department.

Parents in every Missouri school district can choose to take advantage of PAT services -- which include personal visits from certified parent educators, group meetings, developmental screenings, and connections with other community resources -- from the time their children are born until they enter kindergarten.

Findings

Based on data reported for the first year of the project, the following findings were made:

- When Parents as Teachers (PAT) is combined with any other pre-kindergarten experience for high-poverty children, the children score above average on all scales when they enter kindergarten.

- The highest performing children participate in Parents as Teachers (PAT) and preschool/center care. Among children who participate in PAT and attend preschool, both minority and non-minority children score above

average. Children who attend high-poverty and low-poverty schools and who participate in PAT and attend preschool score above average.

- Among children whose care and education are solely home-based, those whose families participate in PAT score significantly higher.

- Special-needs children who participate in PAT and preschool, in addition to an early childhood special education program, are rated by teachers as being similar in preparation to average children.

- Head Start children who also participate in PAT and preschool score at average or above.

Observations and Policy Implications

Even though the assessment will be compared to subsequent assessments to affirm the reliability of the results and to show progress over time, there appear to be some findings that can positively inform policy decisions right now. These findings do not stand alone, but seem consistent with what we know from neuroscience research and from other evaluations. Following are observations and potential policy implications that might reasonably be inferred as a result of the SEAP findings.

Observation: Preschool experiences positively affect the performance of minority children who attend high-poverty schools.
Policy Implication: The state should encourage the growth and maintenance of quality public and private preschools. All preschools should be staffed with qualified teachers who are trained to provide an effective, research-based, child-appropriate curriculum. Parents should be encouraged to have their children attend a quality preschool program.

Observation: Participation in Parents as Teachers, when combined with any other significant preschool activity, produces the greatest results.
Policy Implication: Encourage schools to provide PAT to all parents and extend PAT home visitation to parents with children ages 3 to 5. Parent educators should:

- encourage parents to provide frequent opportunities for their children to socialize with other children and adults
- stress the importance of literacy activities
- emphasize the importance of children talking frequently with other children and with adults who possess a rich vocabulary (conversation is necessary to language development)
- stress the importance of a quality preschool experience

Observation: Early literacy experiences are extremely important to school readiness.
Policy Implication: Take all necessary steps to ensure that all parents, care givers, and early

childhood educators understand the importance of reading to and talking with their children and of providing frequent person-to-person early literacy opportunities.

Observation: Parents, child care providers, and preschool providers need to know, understand, and base decisions on the indicators of quality pre-kindergarten programs.
Policy Implication: The state should help parents, child care providers, and preschool providers understand quality pre-kindergarten program indicators. A better understanding of quality indicators should help parents make more informed choices and help providers improve the quality of their programs.

To request a copy of the complete research report, contact:
Dr. Stephen Barr, Assistant Commissioner
Division of Special Education
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573/751-5739

or

Dr. Sharon Ford Schattgen, Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment
Division of Instruction
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573/751-2625

II. Innovative Programs to Better Address the Needs of Youth

Interventions to Prevent and Reduce Antisocial Behavior and Promote Prosocial Behavior

Steven R. Asher, Professor of Psychology
Duke University

The following conversation took place in the lunchroom at an elementary school. It was recorded at a school where my colleagues and I spent a year using a wireless transmission system to observe children's social interactions in their classroom, on the playground, during physical education class, and in the lunchroom. The conversation was between two children who were standing in line, waiting to get their food. One of these children, Bill (a pseudonym) was a child with mild mental retardation who was "mainstreamed" with regular education students for parts of the school day. The other child was Kate (also a pseudonym), a regular education student who was in the same grade as Bill. Kate's comments to Bill were said loudly and clearly were intended to be heard by other children in the lunch line and nearby. Our observer stood a distance away, but was able to record everything because Bill wore a microphone with a light-weight FM transmitter. The observer had an FM receiver in a backpack and held a light-weight 8 millimeter video camera. Bill was one of 33 children who wore the equipment on multiple occasions over the course of the school year.

Kate: "Bill, have you been going to the bathroom in the wrong places?"
Bill: "No, I wouldn't be talking, girl."
Kate (pointing to some meat on the floor, and speaking to some other kids): "Bill's been going to the bathroom in the wrong places."
Bill (to the others): "She's telling me I've been going in the wrong place to the bathroom. That's not what you call it. You call it meat. That is meat on the floor. Somebody dropped it off their sandwich."
Kate (to Bill): "Bill, you ate it."
Bill says, "Nuh, uh, you did."
Kate and Bill: "Nuh, uh, you did." "You did." (back and forth several times.)
Bill: "I'm tired of arguing with you. I'm tired of arguing with girls."
Kate (to everyone): "He went to the bathroom in the wrong place."
Bill says, "Nuh, uh. You lie. That's a piece of meat."
Kate says, "No it ain't. It's not."
Bill and Kate: "Fine." "Fine." (back and forth several times.)
Kate: "You see, why do you keep going to the bathroom in the wrong places, Bill?"
Bill says, "You're lying."
Scott (walking by, to Bill): "Hey, don't sit by me."
Kate: "No, I'm not."
Bill and Kate: "Fine." "Fine." (back and forth several times.)
Bill: "I'm not talking to you."
Kate: "I don't care."

Bill and Kate: "Fine." "Fine." (back and forth several times.)
Kate: "Fine, shut up."
Bill turns and bangs his head against the concrete wall.
Kate: "Fine."

Peer interactions such as these can be very hurtful, but would not ordinarily be classified by school personnel as aggressive behavior or even as overt bullying. If you were a "lunch lady" (as the children referred to the supervisors in the lunchroom) and you were standing 10 to 15 feet away, you might not even be aware that anything out of the ordinary was going on. It is not the kind of behavior that is going to get an adult's attention or get a child reprimanded. Even closer up, Kate's behavior could be mistaken for friendly teasing that is normal among children who are friends. However, in friendly teasing a child stays away from a friend's real sensitivities, and nobody takes you seriously. The other kid usually has a funny comeback, and everybody is laughing. The giveaway that Kate was being mean in this conversation is the fact that Bill wasn't laughing and even ended up hitting his head against the wall in frustration. As a student with mental retardation, Bill was understandably sensitive about how other people saw him. Bill did not have the verbal skills to easily fight back, and Kate was humiliating him.

Peer Rejection in Everyday Life

Conversations like the one between Bill and Kate occur regularly in schools, even in caring and high-quality schools, such as the school where we did our observations. In fact, when we categorized the types of interpersonal rejection that we observed, we identified 32 different kinds of rejecting behavior (Asher, Rose, and Gabriel, in press). We grouped these into six broader categories:

- Excluding and terminating interaction (showing that you do not want to interact with someone);
- Denying access (refusing to let someone have or do something they want);
- Aggressing (attacking someone physically or verbally);
- Dominating (demonstrating that you can push someone around);
- Expressing moral disapproval (taking a superior tone towards another child);
- Third-party rejection (indirect forms of rejection in which a third party is involved).

The 32 ways of conveying rejection we observed included some standard ways, such as denying someone access to a group or ignoring somebody. Other forms of rejection were ways that we did not anticipate. For example, there was one form of rejection under the category of Aggressing that we called "reminiscing/repeating." This involved children bringing up some previous rejection and talking about it again to the child or in the presence of the child who had experienced this rejection. "Aversive noises" (also under the Aggressing category) is another form we did not anticipate. This refers to a child going over to another child and making some kind of loud and obnoxious noise, often in the other child's ear.

"Third-party" rejection was one entire category of rejection that struck us as particularly hurtful and again not fully anticipated. To illustrate, children would sometimes have a child relay a rejecting harsh message to the intended recipient or would say something negative about another child who was physically present and within hearing range but not directly spoken to.

The Consequences of Peer Rejection

Rejected children (i.e., children who are widely disliked by their peers) can be identified using sociometric questionnaires. With this type of measure, children are asked who they most like or do not like, or are asked to rate how much they like to play with or be in activities with each of the other children in their class. Rejected children are the children who few classmates want to be with and many classmates actually actively prefer not to be with. There are between 10 percent and 15 percent of children in school who are in this situation in any given year, and many children suffer from chronic rejection throughout their school careers.

Research indicates various ways in which rejection has an effect on children. First, children who are rejected by their peers report being much more lonely in school. The link between peer rejection and loneliness has been found in middle school, during the mid-elementary school years, and even with children as young as 5 or 6 years of age (see Asher and Hopmeyer, 1997, for a review). Second, researchers find that children who are rejected by other kids show poorer school adjustment. This is reflected in higher absenteeism, complaints about health problems, negative attitudes toward school, and lower grades (see Birch and Ladd, 1996, for a review). Third, one of the rather striking findings in this area of research is that children who are rejected by their peers are much more likely to drop out of school (see Kupersmidt, Coie, and Dodge, 1990; Parker and Asher, 1987, for reviews). The dropout rates among rejected kids are approximately four times higher than the rates for children who are better liked by their peers. Fourth, a troublesome pattern exists in which some children who are rejected by peers for aggressive behavior gravitate toward and affiliate with other children who are also aggressive and rejected. As a result, they begin to hang out with other children who have similarly antisocial behavioral tendencies and values, and this reinforces those tendencies (e.g., Bagwell, 1998; Coie, Lochman, Terry, and Hyman, 1992; Dishion, Andrews, and Crosby, 1995). So for rejected children who start out with somewhat negative forms of behavior and come to be rejected by the majority of their classmates, there is the risk that over time they will become even more involved in aggressive and other forms of antisocial behavior.

Part of the Solution: Intervening with Rejected Children

A major reason why certain children come to be rejected by peers lies in their own behavior toward others (see Coie, Dodge, and Kupersmidt, 1990, for a review). Children who are aggressive (start fights or are mean and hurtful), who are disruptive, or who are anxious and submissive are much more likely to be rejected by other children. On the other hand, children who exhibit prosocial behavior (e.g., cooperative, friendly, kind, helpful) tend to be liked. Likewise, having a good sense of humor tends to lead to acceptance, as does being good at

sports and school work. So it is easy to make the argument that if we are going to try to help children who are having problems in their peer relationships, we should teach children various positive competencies and not just try to reduce negative forms of behavior. Indeed, two decades of research indicates that teaching various prosocial skills helps rejected children to become better accepted by their peers. In the majority of studies on this topic, teaching social skills to peer-rejected children led to increased liking by peers (for reviews see Coie and Koeppl, 1990, Asher, Parker, and Walker, 1996). These findings suggest that adults are not helpless when it comes to helping children with peer relationship problems.

One of the challenges in teaching children social relationship skills is that the social world is complex and children need to cope effectively with a wide array of social tasks. Figure 1 presents a list of some of the social tasks children face in everyday life. As adults, we realize that our social world can be very challenging. This can be true for children as well. In the course of a day at school, children need to have skills for entering a group, negotiating rules, maintaining a conversation, managing conflict, and responding to teasing or other forms of "ambiguous provocation" (see Dodge, 1980). They also need skills for various other tasks such as sticking up for a friend, comforting someone who is upset, paying someone a compliment, retrieving something that another child has taken, apologizing for offending someone, countering a false accusation, and ending an interaction to make an easy transition to a different place, activity, or interaction.

Our challenge as educators and mental health professionals is to teach children ways of handling these tasks that are prosocial and likely to sustain positive relationships with peers. There are a lot of tasks that kids might need help with, and, in fact, a large percentage of children recognize that they do need help with some of the tasks listed in Figure 1 (Asher, Tolan, Rose, and Guerra, in preparation). We need to identify the tasks that give children trouble and figure out ways to help them develop the skills they need for dealing with those tasks.

There is also another aspect of social competence that we need to acknowledge. Competence is not just a matter of the skills needed to accomplish a task, it is also a matter of the kinds of goals that one has in specific social situations (Crick and Dodge, 1994; Renshaw and Asher, 1982). For example, think about the situation in which children are playing a game, and then consider the kinds of goals children might have in a game situation (Taylor and Asher, 1984). Sometimes they have a task-mastery goal; they play a game because they just want to get better at it. Sometimes they have a performance goal; they want to obtain a positive judgment from other people about their competence. Sometimes they have an avoidance goal; they are just trying to avoid looking bad, to get through a situation and to not make a fool of themselves. Sometimes children have rule-oriented or fairness goals -- they just want to make sure that everybody plays the game fairly. Sometimes children have relationship-building/maintenance goals, in which the game context serves the goals of creating or sustaining a positive relationship with other children. Children may also have self-protection goals, in which their major focus is protecting themselves against the possibility of another

child's potential hostility. Sometimes children have dominance goals; they want to control or dominate others and to "run the show." Finally, revenge sometimes emerges as a social goal, with children wanting to get even or get back at somebody.

In recent research we asked children to tell us what goals they would pursue if they were having a mild conflict of interest with a friend (Rose and Asher, 1999). We showed children 30 different situations that involved such conflicts, such as when the child is working on a library project and the friend asks for help on a different assignment, or a situation in which the child is looking forward to playing with a friend, but the friend asks some other children to join in. For each situation, children were asked to rate the extent to which they would pursue various types of goals. They were also asked to rate how likely they would be to do various things in responding to the situation. We found that about 6 percent of children consistently endorsed revenge goals, even in these fairly benign conflict situations with a friend. This troubling approach to handling conflict was found to be injurious to children's relationship health -- endorsing this goal predicted having fewer friends and having friendships characterized by higher levels of conflict.

So, in designing our interventions, we need to not only teach children new skills, we need to help them to focus on goals that are likely to foster positive relations with other children, rather than holding goals that are likely to damage their relationships. Indeed, it is possible that effective social relationship interventions have been successful in part because they lead children to focus on relationship-oriented goals. Oden and Asher's (1977) social skills coaching study can be used to illustrate this point. Children were asked in each session to think about whether the ideas they were discussing (i.e., participating, cooperating, communicating, being a friendly and enjoyable play partner) helped make the games they were playing more fun to play for themselves and their play partners. This focus may have altered the kinds of goals children were focusing on as they played with their peers.

This last example leads to a final point about social skills interventions. This concerns the context we use for intervention and how intervention is implemented. I want to particularly recommend the use of games, sports, and other activities such as drama or other group projects as contexts for teaching children relationship skills. These settings provide a large number of "teachable moments" for building social relationship skills because they are contexts in which various social tasks arise (see, again, Figure 1), and they are contexts in which a variety of goals may be relevant. They also provide settings in which to practice social skills, to receive helpful and constructive feedback, to reflect on alternative goals that could be pursued, and to monitor the impact of one's behavior on others. The fact that games, sports, group projects and drama activities are usually intrinsically interesting to kids also helps solve the problem of motivating children to participate in social skills learning efforts. By making this recommendation, I do not mean to imply that more formal social skills training curricula have no place. To the contrary, curricula can be effective in teaching children new ways of thinking about interpersonal relationships and new ways to solve problems (see Weissberg and Greenberg, 1998, for a review of various programs and research

on their efficacy). My point is that games, sports, drama, and other activities are rich in their potential for helping children learn how to deal with the complexities of their social world.

The Rest of the Solution: Changing the Culture of Schools with Regard to Peer Rejection

Increasing the extent to which rejected children behave prosocially will help to solve the problem of rejection. However, focusing on the rejected child is only one half of the problem of rejection. The other half has to do with the behavior of the children who are doing the rejecting. The culture of our schools tolerates a fairly high level of maltreatment by children of one another. It is not uncommon for children to be bullied and harassed by their peers, and children who are disliked are particularly vulnerable to this sort of treatment. Part of the problem with being a kid who isn't liked very much is that a lot of other children let you know that. And they may let you know it often, and in ways that are painful.

It is perhaps instructive to compare the situation children face in schools to the situations in which adults work. As adults, we don't expect to be the objects of harassment or peer abuse in the workplace. If a worker encountered mean-spirited treatment from a colleague on a production line, in a hallway between offices, in a bathroom, or in the cafeteria, the worker would expect an employer to take action to prevent further negative or inappropriate treatment. Indeed, employees have successfully sued in court when employers fail to remedy the situation. Very few adults think that it's okay to go up to someone they work with and let that person know in mean ways that he or she is not someone whose company they enjoy. By contrast, we have let schools evolve in ways that allow children to behave hurtfully toward one another without adults intervening. Once children start physically pushing each other around, then it is possible that there will be some adult intervention, but otherwise adults pretty much stay out of the picture. In fact, the culture of schools is such that the child who goes to an adult for help is viewed as a whiner or tattler and is often encouraged to work out the problem on his or her own.

Nonetheless, there is an encouraging trend emerging in recent years. Researchers and educators are beginning to focus their efforts on altering the culture of schools to make bullying and victimization unacceptable (see Olweus, 1993, for example). This is a change that requires the cooperation of children, school staff, and parents. It involves a change in our thinking about what sorts of behavior is tolerable in school. It also involves adults being willing to set clear standards of behavior and to communicate their willingness to intervene. Most of all, it involves children taking responsibility for telling adults when they see a problem that they can't solve on their own. We need to change the culture of schools so that children are less hurtful to one another. Whatever it is that Bill might have done to earn other children's dislike, he and other children in similar situations should be afforded the same rights as those of an employee in a factory, office, or retail store.

Figure 1: An Incomplete List of Social Tasks

- Entering a Group
- Responding to Ambiguous Provocation
- Managing Conflict
- Negotiating Rules
- Maintaining Interactions
- Listening
- Communicating Contingently
- Terminating Interaction
- Coping with Rejection
- Coping with Public Failure
- Coping with Public Success
- Sticking up for a Friend
- Asking for Help
- Helping
- Comforting
- Coping with Teasing
- Expressing Affection
- Anger Management
- Complimenting
- Persuading
- Generating "Fun" Ideas
- Sharing Resources/Belongings
- Making Requests
- Responding to Requests
- Retrieving Belongings
- Dealing with Loss
- Self-Disclosing
- Eliciting Disclosure
- Apologizing
- Expressing Appreciation
- Keeping Secrets
- Forgiving
- Refusing a Dare
- Defending Self
- Avoiding Danger
- Getting Picked for Teams/Activities
- Coping with False Accusations
- Getting Even
- Achieving Equity/Fairness
- Resisting Distraction by Others

References

Asher, S. R., & Hopmeyer, A. (1997). Loneliness in childhood. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), Children's needs II: Development, problems and alternatives (pp. 279-292). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Asher, S. R., Parker. J. G., & Walker, D. L. (1996). Distinguishing friendship from acceptance: Implications for intervention and assessment. In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), The company they keep: Friendship during childhood and adolescence (pp. 366-405). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, S. R., Rose, A. J., & Gabriel, S. W. (in press). Peer rejection in everyday life. In M. Leary (Ed.), Interpersonal rejection. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bagwell, C. L. (1998). The friendship relations of antisocial boys. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, Durham, NC.

Birch, S. H., & Ladd, J. W. (1996). Interpersonal relationships in the school environment and children's early school adjustment: The role of teachers and peers. In J. Juvonen, & K. R. Wentzel (Eds.), Social motivation (pp. 199-225). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 17-59). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., & Koeppl, G. K. (1990). Adapting intervention to the problems of aggressive and disruptive rejected children. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 309-337). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., Lochman, J. E., Terry, R., & Hyman, C. (1992). Predicting early adolescent disorder from childhood aggression and peer rejection. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60, 783-792.

Crick, N. R. & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 74-101.

Dishion, T. J., Andrews, D. W., & Crosby, L. (1995). Antisocial boys and their friends in early adolescence: Relationship characteristics, quality, and interactional process. Child Development, 66, 139-151.

Dodge, K. A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development, 51, 162-170.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1990). The role of poor peer relationships in the development of disorder. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 274-305). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oden, S., & Asher, S. R. (1977). Coaching children in social skills for friendship making. Child Development, 48, 495-506.

Olweus, D. (1993) Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? Psychological Bulletin, 102, 357-389.

Renshaw, P. D., & Asher, S. R. (1982). Social competence and peer status: The distinction between goals and strategies. In K. H. Rubin & H. S. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood (pp. 375-395). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (1999). Children's goals and strategies in response to conflicts within a friendship. Developmental Psychology, 35, 69-79.

Taylor, A. R., & Asher, S. R. (1984). Children's goals and social competence: Individual differences in a game-playing context. In T. Field, J. L. Roopnarine, & M. Segal (Eds.), Friendship in normal and handicapped children (pp. 53-78). Norwood: Ablex.

Weissberg, R. P., & Greenberg, M. T. (1998). School and community competence-enhancement and prevention programs. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) and I. E. Sigel & K. A. Renninger (Vol. Eds.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4: Child psychology in practice (5th edition). New York: John Wiley.

Project Learn: Making the After-School Hours Work for Boys & Girls Club Members

Carter J. Savage, Senior Director, Education Programs
Boys & Girls Clubs of America

Introduction

Over the past decade, non-profit youth development organizations have become acutely aware of the need to develop and implement educational programs that work. For the most part, local organizations have had very little "hard data" to verify that what they were doing during the after-school hours had a significant impact on the academic lives of young people. Thanks largely to the work outlined in the 1998 U.S. Department of Education report, *Safe and Smart: Making the After Hours Work for Kids*, youth development organizations are now able to put together research and program evaluations that articulate the potential of after-school educational programs.

Boys & Girls Clubs of America's *Project Learn* is one such program that enhances our understanding of the positive impact non-profit youth development organizations can have on academic outcomes. The evaluation of *Project Learn* over two and a half years demonstrated an 11 percent increase in the overall grade point average of its participants. Moreover, *Project Learn* participants' overall grade point averages were 15 percent higher than non-Boys & Girls Club participants. Most important to this article, *Project Learn* demonstrated how participants' academic successes increased their individual motivations for program participation and facilitated self-directed learning.

The Need

There should be no doubt that school-age youth are in need of additional academic support. Youth, particularly from low-income and minority communities, are failing to learn basic skills (i.e., reading, writing, and mathematics) during the existing school day. Recent statistics support this statement:

- School-age children and teens who are unsupervised during the after-school hours are far more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and tobacco; engage in criminal and other high-risk behaviors; earn poor grades; and drop out of school than those who have the opportunity to benefit from constructive activities supervised by responsible adults.[1]
- A 1994 Harris poll stated that more than half of teachers singled out "children who are left on their own after school" as the primary explanation for students' difficulties in class.[2]
- Many children, especially low-income children, lose ground in reading if they are not engaged in organized learning over the summer.[3]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Education (1998). "Safe and Smart: Making the After-School Hours Work for Kids."
[2] Ibid
[3] Ibid

- In 1998, 70 percent of fourth graders read below the proficient level, 67 percent of eighth graders read below the proficient level, and 60 percent of 12th graders read below the proficient level.[4]
- In 1998, 90 percent of African American fourth graders, 86 percent of Hispanic fourth graders and 86 percent of Native American fourth graders read below the proficient level.[5]
- In 1996, 79 percent of fourth graders performed below the proficient level in mathematics, 76 percent of eighth graders performed below the proficient level in mathematics, and 84 percent of twelfth graders performed below the proficient level in mathematics.[6]
- 95 percent of African American fourth graders, 92 percent of Hispanic fourth graders and 92 percent of Native American fourth graders performed below the proficient level in mathematics.[7]

Given that at-risk youth need additional academic support, the question arises: Can after-school programs affect the academic performance of youth? Recent research indicates that after-school programs have a significant impact on the academic achievement of youth. According to *Safe and Smart: Making the After-School Hours Work for Kids*, after-school programs can:

- Increase achievement in math, reading and other subjects.
- Help children develop greater confidence in their academic abilities.
- Increase school attendance rates.
- Improve the quantity and quality of completed homework.
- Improve rates of high school graduation.
- Improve behavior of students.

Boys & Girls Clubs of America's Project Learn

Project Learn: The Educational Enhancement Program is Boys & Girls Clubs of America's response to the need of its youth for after-school and summer academic enrichment. This program, based upon the research of Dr. Reginald Clark, is a strategy designed to enable Clubs to assist their members in increasing their academic scores.

Background

Dr. Reginald Clark, an education researcher and consultant, has explored the relationship of the non-school hours and the academic achievement of low-income children and teens. His research has demonstrated that the ways students from disadvantaged circumstances use their time out of school are important predictors of their academic success. Clark found that low-achieving students spend

---

[4] National Center for Education Statistics (1999). "NEAP 1998 Reading Report Card for the Nation and the States."
[5] Ibid
[6] National Center for Education Statistics (1997). "NEAP 1996 Mathematics Report Card for the Nation and States."
[7] Ibid

the majority of their non-school hours involved in activities that have little benefit to them during their in-school time. On the other hand, high-achieving students participate in more activities that reinforce the skills and knowledge learned in school. Thus, these students are constantly learning and building upon knowledge acquired in school.

Clark's research also identified specific out-of-school activities that had a significant effect on the academic success of low-income students. Labeling these *high-yield learning activities*, he observed that high-achieving, low-income students engaged in these activities approximately 25 to 35 hours per week. High-yield learning activities include:

- Four to five hours of discussions with knowledgeable adults (teen rap sessions, talking with parents, etc.).
- Four to five hours of leisure reading (short stories, sports page of newspaper, adolescent/teen magazines).
- One to two hours of writing activities (writing telephone messages, writing poetry, journal writing).
- Five to six hours of homework help and study (homework completion, studying, tutoring, etc.).
- Two to three hours of helping others (chores, community service projects).
- Four to five hours of games utilizing cognitive skills (Monopoly, Scrabble, Sim City, Oregon Trail).

The Components of Project Learn

Project Learn was developed based on this research and its implications. *Project Learn* consists of five components:

- **Homework help and tutoring.** This program component draws from experience with Boys & Girls Clubs of America's national homework help and tutorial program, POWER HOUR. Through this component, Clubs enable members to develop the daily habit of completing homework and class preparation in a safe, quiet, allocated space with staff and volunteer encouragement for five to six hours weekly.

- **High-yield learning activities** (HYLAs). Clark's model provides Club staff with a vehicle for extending learning opportunities outside of the learning center. Most importantly, it helps youth practically apply what they learn in school by making positive and productive choices about how they spend their leisure time at the Club and at home.

- **Parent involvement.** Through parent involvement, Clubs seek to empower the adult members in a child's life to support his or her academic development. This process not only includes involving parents and adults in Club activities, but also providing these adults with opportunities for self-improvement (e.g., G.E.D. programs, literacy programs, etc.) and giving parents materials and activities to do with their children at home.

- **Collaboration with schools.** To effectively supplement the work of the schools, Club staff must also have a relationship with school officials, particularly teachers. This component enables Clubs to work with teachers to develop individualized plans for Club members to build their competency in challenging subjects.

- **Incentives.** Incentives are a means to reward Club members for positive academic participation and encourage parent involvement in *Project Learn*. As an introductory phase, material rewards (e.g., pizza parties, book bags, etc.) are used. However, the real goal of the incentive component is to help young people develop their own internal means of remaining self-motivated to continue pursuing scholastic success. As children and teens perform increasingly well in school, they become proud of themselves, and in turn, work harder to achieve greater success in school.

***Implementation and Evaluation of* Project Learn**

The Carnegie Corporation of New York partnered with Boys & Girls Clubs of America in the development of *Project Learn*. Carnegie funded the implementation and evaluation of this model in 1995. Five Boys & Girls Club sites in public housing developments across the United States were selected for field testing, and Club staff members were trained in the model. To test *Project Learn*'s effectiveness, Dr. Steven Schinke of Columbia University's School of Social Work performed a 30-month evaluation of the program.

Evaluation Methodology

In April 1996, Boys & Girls Clubs of America implemented the *Project Learn* model (then called the Educational Enhancement Program) in public housing developments in New York City; Cleveland; Oakland, Calif.; Edinburg, Texas; and Tampa, Fla. Schinke's evaluation research design compared educational outcomes for *Project Learn* participants ages 10 to 15 against outcomes for similar youth enrolled in five "traditional" Boys & Girls Clubs (not implementing *Project Learn*) and similar youth participating in five non-Boys & Girls Club programs.

All sites were located in public housing developments. The cities chosen reflected Boys & Girls Clubs of America's need to field test *Project Learn* in sites that represented the diversity of its Clubs geographically. Public housing developments were chosen because the youth living there are representative of children and teens who need this type of intervention. It was thought that if *Project Learn* could work in these communities, it could work anywhere else.

Across the 15 sites, 992 youth initially took part in the evaluation. The sample was 40 percent female and had an average age of 12.3 years (SD=1.9). Youth did not differ in mean age or gender distributions among program, comparison, and control groups. Youth from program and comparison sites were members of their respective Boys & Girls Clubs. Youth from control sites were regular users of the respective facilities (after-school, recreational, and other human

services programs). According to staff records, youth attendance and participation rates were similar and uniformly high across the three groups.

Graduate students (masters and doctoral degree candidates) from Columbia University were trained to objectively collect academic performance data from youth, teachers, and schools. Data were collected at four points in time: pre-program, at seven months, at 18 months, and at 30 months. The data collected on the youth in all 15 sites were school grades, youth self-reports, and teacher evaluations.

Findings of Project Learn Evaluation

Thirty months after the establishment of the program, *Project Learn* participants not only increased their grade point averages, but also had markedly higher school scores than the youth participating in other after-school programs. By the final data collection period, *Project Learn* participants had:

- Increased their overall grade point average by 11 percent.
- Increased their mathematics grade point average by 13 percent.
- Increased their history grade point average by 13 percent.
- Increased their science grade point average by 10 percent.
- Increased their spelling grade point average by 22 percent.
- Increased their reading grade point average by 5 percent.

Compared to non-Boys & Girls Club youth, *Project Learn* participants had a:

- 15 percent higher overall grade point average.
- 16 percent higher grade point average in mathematics.
- 20 percent higher grade point average in history.
- 14 percent higher grade point average in science.
- 20 percent higher grade point average in spelling.
- 9 percent higher grade point average in reading.

Additionally, *Project Learn* participants decreased the number of days they were absent by 66 percent. Compared to non-Boys & Girls Club youth, *Project Learn* youth missed 87 percent fewer days of school.

Teachers rated *Project Learn* youth as having higher reading, writing, and overall school performance than non-Boys & Girls Club youth. Furthermore, they reported that these youth had greater interest in class material than non-Boys & Girls Club youth.

From the youth surveys, *Project Learn* participants reported reading and writing more than non-Boys & Girls Club youth. In fact, the more *Project Learn* youth participated in the program, the more they:

- Read books and magazines.
- Received help with their homework.
- Talked with adults about current events.
- Tutored younger members.

The evaluation results clearly prove the value of a Boys & Girls Club-based educational enhancement program for disadvantaged youth. Data collected from youth, teachers, and school records dramatically demonstrate *Project Learn*'s effectiveness. In his final report, Schinke concludes, "Boys & Girls Clubs of America can rightfully take credit for helping youth in essential areas of academic achievement, school behavior, and study skills."

A New, Exciting Vision for Educational Enhancement

This research had profound effects on how Boys & Girls Clubs of America envisioned educational enhancement. Prior to this, a Club's academic enhancement activities were more than likely limited to homework help and tutoring. Club professionals believed that Clubs were not schools. Clubs had an equally important but different function than schools. Thus, it was thought that implementing "school-like" programs in the Club was to attempt to replicate school in the Club.

As a result, most Clubs confined their education program opportunities to the Club's learning center and its learning center director. As one might imagine, many children and teens who were failing in school or disliked school simply avoided this area of the Club building. Since learning activities were confined to a certain area, a certain time, and a particular staff person, children and teens either came to the Club after the education programs had ended for the day or chose alternate activities during those program hours. Thus, education program participants tended to be those youth who were already moderately successful in school.

Ironically, when Clubs did implement education programs, they looked very "school-like." Learning centers, during homework help time, resembled mini-classrooms. Staff members and volunteers acted similarly to classroom teachers, giving lectures and assignments. Many Clubs failed to recognize and take advantage of the unique opportunities a Club setting provides to stimulate learning in young people.

Clark's findings about the benefits of high-yield learning activities suggested that educational enhancement is much more than homework help, tutoring, and the learning center. Boys & Girls Club members can learn and reinforce skills and information directly related to their academics in the gym, games room, arts and craft room, etc. By using high-yield learning activities, Clubs incorporate into daily Club activities the critical skills and information children and teens need. In other words, they cannot "escape." By using high-yield learning activities as the template for program development and scheduling, the entire Club can be transformed into a learning center. In fact, every moment of a young person's time at a Boys & Girls Club can be a learning experience.

Although children and teens may not be able to "escape" learning in the Club, the goal is not only to make learning exciting, but also to make it self-directed. One of the major findings of the evaluation is that the more youth participated, the more they enjoyed the program, and the better they performed academically. As staff members expose children and teens to new ideas, careers, events, and activities, they spark their interest and encourage their questions. Using these questions as a springboard, staff members enable Club members to further explore their areas of interest. As staff members are able to do this on a daily basis, Clubs develop members who are not only successful in school, but also become life-long learners.

For Boys & Girls Club staff, *Project Learn* requires a change in how they conceptualize their jobs. Since *Project Learn* is not a curriculum, but rather a strategy, staff members are trained to think strategically about educational opportunities in the Club. Whereas there are some formal educational activities, the major learning opportunities for youth come through the Club's daily, normal programs and activities. Staff members must ask themselves: What academic skills are being reinforced in this activity? What information can be conveyed that will enable members to be more successful in school?

Where Will Boys & Girls Clubs of America Go From Here?

Although Schinke's evaluation demonstrated the positive impact of *Project Learn*, this is only the beginning. Boys & Girls Clubs of America's youth development outcomes for education state that by age 18, Club members should:

- Be proficient in basic educational disciplines (i.e., reading, writing, mathematics).
- Be proficient in the use of technology (computers).
- Graduate from high school.
- Become life-long learners.

Project Learn provides the framework for thinking about these outcomes, but other, more specific programs (reading, writing, science, and mathematics) must be developed. Boys & Girls Clubs of America continues to work with research organizations, universities, and other non-profit organizations to develop and implement the most effective education programs available. In addition to its program development efforts, Boys & Girls Clubs of America is also considering the role its facilities play in the learning process. Specifically, how can the Club's learning center be renovated to better support learning in the after-school hours (while still remaining a fun place to go)? The final consideration is training and professional development. With more than 2,300 Boys & Girls Clubs in the United States and on military bases abroad, this is a monumental task.

Project Learn is an exciting, dynamic new program for local Clubs. More importantly,

Project Learn provides children and teens with an opportunity to use their after-school hours in a fun, yet academically productive way.

The Talent Development Model
Bonnie Erickson

Consultant, Center for Social Organization of Schools
Johns Hopkins University

Bonnie Erickson, currently a consultant with the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University, was Principal of Patterson High School, a non-selective high school in Baltimore, Maryland, when it instituted the *Talent Development Model* in 1994. This reform involved reorganizing the school into smaller, self-contained units and demonstrated how personalizing relationships and focusing on curriculum can create a school climate that is safe and conducive to learning. Her presentation described the model and her experiences in implementing it. The pamphlet that follows provides information about the *Talent Development Model.*

THE Talent Development High School

with Career Academies

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON THE EDUCATION OF STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK / JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

CRESPAR

THE TALENT DEVELOPMENT HIGH SCHOOL WITH CAREER ACADEMIES

The Talent Development High School with Career Academies is a comprehensive reform model for large high schools that have serious problems of student attendance, discipline, achievement scores, and dropout rates. The model consists of **specific** changes in school organization and management to establish a safe and serious climate for learning and to motivate regular attendance by students and staff. It also includes curriculum and instructional components designed to help students overcome poor prior preparation and become more engaged and successful learners. Though more prescriptive than other high school reform programs, CRESPAR strives to balance committed implementation of core model components with a reliance on school-based teachers and administrators to own and adapt the Talent Development model to meet the needs of their school.

The Talent Development High School with Career Academies was initiated in 1994 through a partnership of The Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR) and Patterson High School and has now expanded to high schools within and beyond Baltimore.

ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS
OF THE
TALENT DEVELOPMENT HIGH SCHOOL MODEL

■ Ninth Grade Success Academy

A Ninth Grade Success Academy is a self-contained, school-within-a-school organized around interdisciplinary teams designed to provide incoming ninth graders with a smooth transition into high school.

■ Career Academies for the Upper Grades

Career Academies are self-contained, small learning communities with a career focus that enroll 250-350 students in grades 10, 11, and 12. Career academies provide all students with a college preparatory curriculum and work-based learning experiences supported by industry partners. Students study in one of several career pathways within the academy and teachers are organized into pathway teams.

■ Four-Period Day

In a Talent Development High School, the schedule is organized around four 80- to 90-minute periods. Extended class periods allow for a greater variety of "student-centered" instructional approaches such as cooperative learning, projects, and simulations.

■ Common Core Curriculum

The Talent Development High School does not track students into college preparatory, vocational, or general curricular tracks. Instead, a basic set of college preparatory academic courses is required for all students across the four years of high school.

■ Curriculum and Instruction Interventions

In a Talent Development High School, the ninth grade curriculum features *Transition to Advanced Mathematics* and *Strategic Reading* courses. These supplement Algebra and English, providing a *double dose* of Math and English for students who need it. The ninth grade curriculum also features a *Freshman Seminar* course in which students learn the importance of credits, effective social and study skills, keyboarding and basic computer literacy, and engage in college and career awareness activities. The English curriculum across all grades is further supported through *Student Team Literature* and *Student Team Writing* which provide curriculum materials and instructional processes to enhance student engagement and learning.

■ Extra Help

Students do not repeat failed courses during the regular school day in a Talent Development High School. Summer School, Saturday School, and After-hours Credit School are offered so students can recover from course failures and missed credits can be earned.

■ Twilight School

The Talent Development model also includes an alternative after-hours program for students who have serious attendance or discipline problems or who are coming to the school from incarceration or suspension from another school. Instruction is offered in small classes, and extensive services are provided by guidance and support staff.

■ Professional Development

Talent Development High Schools commit to ongoing planning and professional development needed to implement and sustain the core components of the Talent Development High School model. Teachers on special assignment (curriculum coaches) work with classroom teachers to develop instructional capacity within the school at the classroom level.

NINTH GRADE SUCCESS ACADEMY

Ninth graders are adolescents undergoing the difficult transition from middle school to high school. Schools can ease the transition to high school, and help more students stay in school and earn promotion, by creating a Ninth Grade Success Academy. A strong Success Academy serves as a bridge that spans the rough waters of adolescence, preparing students academically and socially for the rigors of high school and college.

CENTRAL FEATURES OF A NINTH GRADE SUCCESS ACADEMY

School-within-a-school: A Success Academy is self-contained, with its own administrative and teaching staff, its own entrance, and walls and doors that physically separate it from the rest of the school building. This structure enables adults and students to know each other well and fosters collaboration among staff.

Interdisciplinary teams: A Success Academy is organized around several interdisciplinary teams made up of at least four teachers — a Math, an English, a Science, and a Social Studies teacher — who share the same group of 150-200 students. These teachers share a common planning period which they use to address individual student problems, coordinate instruction, and plan other team activities.

Flexible block schedule with extended periods: Teachers on the same team teach the same groups of students during the same block of time each school day. This allows students to be regrouped according to instructional needs and provides flexibility in the day for longer lessons or special activities. Extended periods of 80-90 minutes also allow for a greater variety of "student-centered" instructional approaches such as cooperative learning, projects, and simulations.

Double dose curriculum in English and Math: An effective ninth grade curriculum must address the fact that many urban students enter ninth grade with very poor prior preparation in Math and English. Ninth Grade Success Academies implement CRESPAR's Transition to Advanced Mathematics and Strategic Reading courses to supplement regular Algebra and English courses, providing students with a double dose of instruction in Math and English. Ninth grade English courses are further strengthened by the integration of Student Team Literature (STLit) and Student Team Writing (STW).

Career and college awareness through Freshman Seminar: A special ninth grade course, Freshman Seminar, gives students the information they need to succeed in high school. Students learn the importance of credits, effective social and study skills, and keyboarding and basic computer literacy. They also develop a strong awareness of college and postsecondary options and explore the world of careers.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT HIGH SCHOOLS:
Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Support

The goal of the Talent Development High School is to provide students with the learning opportunities, motivation, and supports they need to overcome poor prior preparation and successfully complete a core college prep curriculum. It is also the goal of the Talent Development High School to provide every teacher with the support he or she needs to teach effective standards-based lessons which encourage active and contextual learning within ninety-minute blocks.

THE NINTH GRADE CURRICULUM

During the ninth grade, Talent Development High Schools provide students with an intensive academic experience designed to break the cycle of failure which is epidemic in large, urban, non-selective high schools. Every ninth grader who needs it receives a "double dose" of mathematics and English instruction. They take these subjects for 90 minutes a day for the entire year. All students also take a Freshman Seminar course designed to give them the social and study skills they need to succeed in high school.

Typical Student Schedule in the Ninth Grade of a Talent Development High School	
1st Semester	**2nd Semester**
Strategic Reading	English 1
Transition to Advanced Mathematics	Algebra 1 or Integrated Mathematics
Social Studies or Science	Science or Social Studies
Freshman Seminar	Elective

Currently, we are developing four courses for the Ninth Grade Success Academy which are being designed to address the needs of students with poor prior preparation. These courses are being piloted during the 1998-1999 school year, will be field tested during the 1999-2000 school year, and will be available in final form for the 2000-2001 school year. For each course, we are developing student and teacher materials, as well as professional development materials and trainers' guides. These course are:

***Strategic Reading*:** This is a balanced literacy course designed to provide ninth grade students who are two or more grade levels behind with specific reading strategies. Throughout the course, students learn how and when to use these strategies, gain ongoing experience with writing, and read relevant and authentic sources.

***Student Team Literature and Student Team Writing*:** These are innovative but thoroughly tested strategies for teaching literature and writing, which use curricular materials and a cooperative approach, that enable students and teachers to study great literature together. The materials include teacher guides, Partner Discussion Guides, literature tests and word mastery tests. The Partner Discussion Guides present students with questions about the literature they

are reading which require them to think analytically and comparatively, to draw conclusions, and to analyze plot, literary devices, and the writer's style and technique. To date, we have developed Partner Discussion Guides for many classic high school novels, as well as more contemporary literature which appeals to adolescents.

***Transition to Advanced Mathematics*:** This course is designed to provide students with the motivation, skills, and approaches they need to succeed in Algebra and Geometry. The main topics covered include rational numbers, coordinate geometry, measurement, data, and variables and functions. Special emphasis is placed on developing students' abilities to call upon their informal mathematical knowledge, discuss their mathematical thinking, and problem solve. A survey of students taking the pilot version of the course during the fall of 1998 found that 82% of the students stated that the course made them feel more confident in their mathematical ability, 70% reported learning skills and concepts that will prepare them for more advanced mathematics, 64% stated that they paid more attention in this class than in other math classes, and 42% reported that the class motivated them to come to school.

***Freshman Seminar*:** This is a course designed to give students the social and study skills they need to engage in active and contextual learning. It also introduces students to high school requirements and procedures, and demonstrates how school and schoolwork are related to adult life and success.

FOUR TIERS OF TEACHER SUPPORT

For each of the courses, we are also creating four tiers of teacher support. The first tier is ongoing, curriculum-specific professional development. For each course, we are designing two to three days of summer training, followed by monthly two- to three-hour sessions during the year. This professional development focuses on modeling upcoming lessons, content knowledge, effective instructional strategies, and classroom management techniques. The second tier of support is provided by a highly trained and respected peer teacher who provides weekly in-classroom implementation assistance (in a non-evaluative manner). The third tier is provided by lead teachers within each school who receive intensive training, and the fourth tier is provided by instructional facilitators from Johns Hopkins University. This facilitated instructional approach has recently been recognized by the National Staff Development Council which has selected Student Team Literature for inclusion in its Consumer Guide of effective staff development programs.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION IN THE CAREER ACADEMIES

With the exception of Student Team Literature and Writing, we are not currently developing complete facilitated instructional programs for the upper grades (10-12). We have developed some materials and will be developing more to support teachers in their efforts to create active and contextual learning opportunities which blend Career Academy themes into core academic courses. These materials include a teacher's manual *(Guide to Using the Extended Class Period)*, three CD-ROMS which provide students with realistic applications of Mathematics and English, and a number of additional application modules for Algebra and Geometry, which we will be developing during the summer of 1999.

THE TWILIGHT SCHOOL

What is the Twilight School?

The *Twilight School* is a program designed to help school staff better meet the needs of students having difficulty adjusting to high school or controlling their behavior. It is an alternative educational program, nested within the regular comprehensive high school, for students demonstrating severe and persistent behavioral and attendance problems that inhibit their ability to be successful in a typical classroom.

What are the objectives of the Twilight School?

Consistent with the philosophy of the Talent Development High School, the main objectives of the Twilight School include the following:

- **to provide** troubled students an opportunity for academic success in a positive, inviting learning environment;
- **to improve** the learning environment and overall school climate;
- **to reduce** the number of short- and long-term suspensions by providing additional disciplinary options;
- **to provide** students who were expelled from other high schools and those reentering the school system from juvenile justice agencies a smoother transition back into school;
- **to teach** students coping skills and strategies to self-regulate their behavior; and
- **to monitor and mentor** students making the transition from the Twilight School to the regular day school program.

Who benefits from the Twilight School?

The Twilight School is intended for students whose conduct and attendance patterns create ongoing problems for teachers and their classmates. The behavior of such students can pose a threat to a school and classroom environment being conducive to learning. Potential candidates for the Twilight School include not only unmanageable students from within the school, but also students who are expelled from other schools as well as those reentering the school system from various juvenile justice agencies.

How does it work?

The Twilight School is in session every weekday, shortly after the closing of the regular school day. Students take three one-hour classes and earn academic credit. Class sizes are small, seldom larger than 20 students, and each class is assigned two teachers (so that the teacher-student ratio is about 10:1). Academic achievement is emphasized in the Twilight School. In addition, students receive ongoing counseling from their counselor/mentor, the school psychologist, and/or the school social worker, as needed. The staffing of the Twilight School consists of the principal, a lead teacher, at least three core subject area teachers, Special Education inclusion specialists, along with the counseling staff.

Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street — Suite 200
Baltimore MD 21218
410-516-8800
410-516-8890 fax

Developmental Assets
Identifying the Building Blocks of Healthy Development that Young People Need to Grow Up to be Healthy, Caring, and Responsible

Judy Taccogna
Director, Education Sector
Search Institute

Judy Taccogna , Director of the Search Institute's Education Sector, discussed the Institute's Developmental Asset Approach. The Institute has identified the essential ingredients for healthy development that enable young people to grow up to be healthy, caring, and responsible adults. These 40 "developmental assets" are divided into two major groups, external and internal. External assets are comprised of subgroups or types consisting of support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, and constructive use of time. Internal assets are divided into commitment to learning, positive values, social competencies, and positive identity.

Based on a 1996-97 survey of nearly 100,000 youth in the sixth to twelfth grades in 213 towns and cities across the United States, the Institute found that the more young people have these 40 developmental assets, the more likely they are to become competent, caring, responsible, and less likely to engage in risky behaviors. Those youth who possess a high number of assets are more prone to have positive attitudes and behaviors, such as maintaining good health, valuing diversity, delaying gratification, and succeeding in school. Those with fewer assets were more apt to engage in the most common high-risk behaviors among youth -- alcohol use, illicit drug use, sexual activity, and violence.

A complete list of the assets and the extent to which the youth surveyed possess them follows. It is preceded by an explanation of the asset categories. This material is reproduced with the permission of the Search Institute.

The Asset Approach

giving kids what they need to succeed

Why do some kids grow up with ease, while others struggle? Why do some kids get involved in dangerous activities, while others spend their time contributing to society? Why do some youth "beat the odds" in difficult situations, while others get trapped?

Many factors influence why some young people have successes in life and why others have a harder time. Economic circumstances, genetics, trauma, and many other factors play a role. But these factors—which seem difficult, if not impossible, to change—aren't all that matters. Research by Search Institute has identified 40 concrete, positive experiences and qualities—"developmental assets"—that have a tremendous influence on young people's lives. And they are things that people from all walks of life can help to nurture.

Research shows that the 40 developmental assets help young people make wise decisions, choose positive paths, and grow up competent, caring, and responsible. The assets (see page 2) are grouped into eight categories:

- **Support**—Young people need to experience support, care, and love from their families and many others. They need organizations and institutions that provide positive, supportive environments.
- **Empowerment**—Young people need to be valued by their community and have opportunities to contribute to others. For this to occur, they must be safe and feel secure.
- **Boundaries and expectations**—Young people need to know what is expected of them and whether activities and behaviors are "in bounds" or "out of bounds."
- **Constructive use of time**—Young people need constructive, enriching opportunities for growth through creative activities, youth programs, congregational involvement, and quality time at home.
- **Commitment to learning**—Young people need to develop a lifelong commitment to education and learning.
- **Positive values**—Youth need to develop strong values that guide their choices.
- **Social competencies**—Young people need skills and competencies that equip them to make positive choices, to build relationships, and to succeed in life.
- **Positive identity**—Young people need a strong sense of their own power, purpose, worth, and promise.

The asset framework is a framework that includes everyone. Families, schools, neighborhoods, congregations, and all organizations, institutions, and individuals in a community can play a role in building assets for youth. This brochure introduces the assets, shows their power and presence in young people's lives, and gives concrete suggestions for what you can do to build assets.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES
HEALTHY YOUTH

The Asset Approach: Giving Kids What They Need to Succeed. Copyright © 1997 by Search Institute, 700 S. Third Street, Suite 210, Minneapolis, MN 55415. All rights reserved. Unless otherwise noted in the text, no part of this publication may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever, mechanical or electronic, without prior permission from the publisher, except in brief quotations or summaries in articles or reviews, or as individual charts or graphs for educational use. For additional permission, write to Permissions at Search Institute.

Search INSTITUTE — Practical research benefiting children and youth

40 DEVELOPMENTAL ASSETS

Search Institute has identified the following building blocks of healthy development that help young people grow up healthy, caring, and responsible.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES HEALTHY YOUTH

	Category	Asset Name and Definition
External Assets	Support	1. **Family Support**-Family life provides high levels of love and support. 2. **Positive Family Communication**-Young person and her or his parent(s) communicate positively, and young person is willing to seek advice and counsel from parents. 3. **Other Adult Relationships**-Young person receives support from three or more nonparent adults. 4. **Caring Neighborhood**-Young person experiences caring neighbors. 5. **Caring School Climate**-School provides a caring, encouraging environment. 6. **Parent Involvement in Schooling**-Parent(s) are actively involved in helping young person succeed in school.
	Empowerment	7. **Community Values Youth**-Young person perceives that adults in the community value youth. 8. **Youth as Resources**-Young people are given useful roles in the community. 9. **Service to Others**-Young person serves in the community one hour or more per week. 10. **Safety**-Young person feels safe at home, school, and in the neighborhood.
	Boundaries & Expectations	11. **Family Boundaries**-Family has clear rules and consequences and monitors the young person's whereabouts. 12. **School Boundaries**-School provides clear rules and consequences. 13. **Neighborhood Boundaries**-Neighbors take responsibility for monitoring young people's behavior. 14. **Adult Role Models**-Parent(s) and other adults model positive, responsible behavior. 15. **Positive Peer Influence**-Young person's best friends model responsible behavior. 16. **High Expectations**-Both parent(s) and teachers encourage the young person to do well.
	Constructive Use of Time	17. **Creative Activities**-Young person spends three or more hours per week in lessons or practice in music, theater, or other arts. 18. **Youth Programs**-Young person spends three or more hours per week in sports, clubs, or organizations at school and/or in the community. 19. **Religious Community**-Young person spends one or more hours per week in activities in a religious institution. 20. **Time at Home**-Young person is out with friends "with nothing special to do" two or fewer nights per week.
Internal Assets	Commitment to Learning	21. **Achievement Motivation**-Young person is motivated to do well in school. 22. **School Engagement**-Young person is actively engaged in learning. 23. **Homework**-Young person reports doing at least one hour of homework every school day. 24. **Bonding to School**-Young person cares about her or his school. 25. **Reading for Pleasure**-Young person reads for pleasure three or more hours per week.
	Positive Values	26. **Caring**-Young person places high value on helping other people. 27. **Equality and Social Justice**-Young person places high value on promoting equality and reducing hunger and poverty. 28. **Integrity**-Young person acts on convictions and stands up for her or his beliefs. 29. **Honesty**-Young person "tells the truth even when it is not easy." 30. **Responsibility**-Young person accepts and takes personal responsibility. 31. **Restraint**-Young person believes it is important not to be sexually active or to use alcohol or other drugs.
	Social Competencies	32. **Planning and Decision Making**-Young person knows how to plan ahead and make choices. 33. **Interpersonal Competence**-Young person has empathy, sensitivity, and friendship skills. 34. **Cultural Competence**-Young person has knowledge of and comfort with people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds. 35. **Resistance Skills**-Young person can resist negative peer pressure and dangerous situations. 36. **Peaceful Conflict Resolution**-Young person seeks to resolve conflict nonviolently.
	Positive Identity	37. **Personal Power**-Young person feels he or she has control over "things that happen to me." 38. **Self-Esteem**-Young person reports having a high self-esteem. 39. **Sense of Purpose**-Young person reports that "my life has a purpose." 40. **Positive View of Personal Future**-Young person is optimistic about her or his personal future

This page may be reproduced for educational, noncommercial uses only.
Copyright © 1997 by Search Institute, 700 S. Third Street, Suite 210, Minneapolis, MN 55415; 800-888-7828; www.search-institute.org

III. Increasing School Safety and Preventing Youth Violence

The National Collaborative on Violence Prevention

Linda K. Bowen, Executive Director, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention

I have been asked to describe the *National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention*, share its lessons (successes and failures), and offer some insights into how schools can connect with, enhance, and learn from community-based efforts to prevent violence.

Philosophy and Goals of NFCVP

The National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention is a partnership among public and private grant makers, experts in violence prevention and related disciplines, and community collaborations. It was established in 1994 to promote the development of safe and healthy communities by mobilizing national and local resources and leadership to prevent violence. We have raised over $10 million nationally from public, private, and corporate funders and more than $7 million locally in cash and in-kind resources.

We are organized around two basic beliefs: that violence is, in fact, preventable and that local solutions developed within broad-based collaboratives are among the most effective means of preventing violence.

We support strategies that emphasize citizen engagement and community empowerment and mprehensively address the range of factors that undermine safety.

Our work is realized at the national and local levels. At the national level we have five basic strategies:

- We support community-based initiatives that demonstrate the power of local action to prevent violence.
- We convene key constituencies around issues of building safe and healthy communities and preventing violence.
- We engage in advocacy designed to influence public perception, generate public will, and change public policy on violence prevention.
- We communicate findings, research, and lessons learned to communities and opinion leaders.
- We serve as a bridge to the philanthropic community, translating the lessons of local community initiatives so that funders can be more strategic and effective in their grant making.

At the local level, our program is designed to build the capacity of collaborative efforts to develop, implement, and sustain comprehensive efforts to build safe communities. We provide financial assistance, technical support, and evaluation to support the development of locally driven solutions to community violence problems. We strongly believe in local control and do not advance a particular model of problem solving, but we have a few requirements. These groups were asked to:

- Develop broad-based, multi-sectoral, interdisciplinary collaboratives that included those most directly affected by violence.
- Implement community-driven primary violence prevention solutions and use evaluation to inform their efforts.
- Show the ability to meet strict matching requirements and the ability to sustain their efforts.

Presently we provide funding and support to eight community collaborations across the country. Their communities are very diverse, as is their violence prevention work, which encompasses:

Youth Violence Prevention
These efforts include youth development activities such as mentoring, after-school recreational and tutorial programs, conflict resolution training, gang mediation and intervention, and support to families of at-risk youth.

Family Violence Prevention
Implementation activities include a nationally recognized violence prevention curriculum designed to provide conflict resolution training, mentoring, and education to children and youth and parenting education to adult participants; a public awareness family violence prevention educational campaign targeted toward the business community; and family support, parenting education, and employment and training.

Community Organizing
Some of our collaboratives are working intensively to organize and mobilize grassroots community members, develop shared community values and norms, foster responsibility among all community residents for positive community development, and restore the physical vitality of communities. Initial community-building activities have included boarding up and/or renovating abandoned and blighted houses, working with local authorities to get housing codes enforced, working with community policing to control gang activity and drug trafficking, working with community residents to develop parks and beautify common areas, and developing small training and employment programs.

Policy Development
Activities include gaining public and legislative support for gun control measures and working with local governments to enact codes and ordinances to revitalize neighborhoods.

Media Advocacy
Most collaboratives engage in some kind of public education and awareness media campaign, primarily to involve the media in reframing its current focus on crime control to one of violence prevention and peace promotion, and to improve the portrayals of youth and people of color in the media.

Our collaboratives have experienced some modest successes. For example:

- In the East Bay of California, the collaborative has been instrumental in getting a comprehensive junk gun ban implemented throughout their corridor and in the state. That collaborative also has modeled a successful truancy prevention program that "sweeps" truant children from the street and engages them and their families in comprehensive support to prevent future truancy episodes.
- In Santa Barbara, California, the collaborative has been cited as the force behind the cessation of gang violence, which has dramatically decreased gang killings in that city.
- In Spartanburg, South Carolina, the collaborative successfully implemented a community-organizing strategy that led to a decrease in 911 calls from more than 300 to 10 during a two-year period. The collaborative also renovated 45 homes and waged a successful campaign against drug dealers and prostitutes in the community.
- In Flint, Michigan, the collaborative has seeded the development of a number of small community-based efforts that engage youth in community revitalization efforts, entrepreneurial efforts, and activities to support the development of positive visions for Flint.

Redefining Violence Prevention
Our collaboratives would say their most important work and their most important gains lie in the way that they have helped communities to reframe their efforts from ones that prevent violence to ones that build community and promote peace.

This may sound insignificant to you. (In fact, when I say this, it is usually met by much rolling of the eyes.) But this reframing represents a significant shift in the ways that communities are viewing themselves and the ways they want institutions to view them. They have resoundingly said to us that, rather than needing resources to keep bad things from happening, they need time, space, and resources to make good things happen — to

develop positive visions. To determine what they want their children to be, not what they want them to stop being. This shift from violence prevention to peace promotion has meant that communities have had to do several things:

- Deal with class, racial, and economic differences among residents.
- Engage those who are often the target of crime reduction strategies.
- Change their community ethos and the perceptions of those who were not of the community, but who control resources the community needs.
- Think about the root causes of violence and the systems that need to exist in their communities to address some of these causes.
- Develop value systems that support peace promotion and community building.

Using this frame, they have placed great expectations on the roles that institutions inside and outside their communities should play. Schools are one of those institutions.

Schools and Collaboration

School systems are members of only two of our local collaboratives. Four other collaboratives have forged relationships with individual schools in their communities. The ways that our collaboratives have involved schools reveal some interesting insights into their perceptions of the schools' role in their community-building efforts.

The collaboratives see schools as places needing services and the support of the collaborative. They have instituted after-school recreational activities, tutorial support, and mentoring programs as adjunct to school efforts. These activities tend to take place outside of the schools, but relationships are made with individual teachers and principals to gain access to children who need support.

Sometimes, but not often, collaboratives see schools as a physical community asset. Beacon schools and other youth development programs use schools as community safe havens for youth development activities. Gaining access to schools during non-school hours continues to be a problem for many.

Collaboratives see schools as a means for re-connecting youth to society. One of the first steps employed by collaboratives for children at risk for violence is usually to reconnect them with education. As one of our collaborative members says, "The best way to keep kids from gang-banging is to teach them how to read."

This is generally a point of contention with schools, which have difficulty with at-risk children and understandably do not want to deal with kids engaged in errant behavior. But, while we know that these kids can be very disruptive in school settings, communities

cannot afford to throw them away, because they always ultimately come back to the community. Our collaboratives have demonstrated that they have effective ways of working with hard-to-reach kids. So collaboratives try to work with school systems to integrate these children back into mainstream society.

At one of our sites, this has meant that the truancy prevention program is really a school connection program. Truants are returned to their home schools with the back-up support of the services of the collaborative.

In another collaborative, former gang members were given a second chance at regular education and used to mentor children at risk for gang involvement. This was really a hard one for schools that feared this would become a recruitment tool.

In our work we use the theme, "Schools as a vehicle for furthering the movement for peace and nonviolence." It is a theme that tries to address the systemic issue that, as a society, we have an affinity for violence. Within this theme, collaboratives have owned a value of "non-violence," and they use schools as one means of implementing this value. They take conflict-resolution strategies and embed these within principles of peace and social justice, so that children have a context for their behavior, a connection to one another, and a responsibility to their communities.

The approach that collaboratives take to this theme is involvement of the whole school community. All school personnel are trained in these approaches, not so they can model this behavior to children, but so they all embrace this value as well.

Our Lessons

What have we learned from all of this? Collaboration is the cornerstone of our work. We believe that true collaboration can and should do at least two things in violence prevention. It should lead to specific strategies and activities that address specific violence problems. But more importantly, its greater value to the community is realized by its ability to change the ways that people, public and private organizations, and institutions in the community do business together, generally and singularly, around developing safe communities.

Four years into our work, we do not claim victory, but we have made some gains and learned some important lessons:

- Citizens in poor communities can be engaged and their communities can be organized and mobilized for positive action.
- Violence prevention is a good context for engaging individuals in community action.

- Given local control, our communities want to go much beyond prevention.
- They found prevention limiting and deficit-model oriented, and quickly moved to wanting to "build" rather than "fix," to "promote" rather than "prevent." They began to move toward envisioning peaceful communities, not just communities free from violence.

Over their first three years of work, our local partners cursed us many times to our faces and many more times behind our backs because we forced collaboration on them. But in the last year, as they have begun to see some modest gains, they see the value of collaboration as a vehicle for organizing, educating, and engaging diverse sectors in community change efforts.

Everybody in our field is beginning to understand the interconnectedness of all forms of violence. The angry violent children we sometimes see in our schools are often themselves victims of or witnesses to violence in their homes and/or communities. These children grow up to be the adults who fill our prison cells. With this understanding has come the recognition that we cannot stay in our solitary cells of intervention if we are to develop safe communities.

The challenge for all of us -- and schools are an important part of this -- is to connect our work together and to place it within a framework of promoting the healthy development of our children, families, and communities. To do this will require a shift in the behavior of schools and the community relative to one another:

- We need schools to be *part* of the community, not just *in* the community.
- We need to help schools share resources with other community organizations and with community residents while maintaining control of their educational mandates.
- We need to help schools and communities be responsive to one another to ensure success for children.
- We need communities and the greater society to recognize and change the unfair burden we place on schools for being the socializer, counselor, case manager, and, finally, educator for our children.
- We need to re-connect schools to a positive vision of community growth and development.

Collaboration is one way of fostering that connection. But collaboration only works if it forces us out of our traditional boxes, modes of thinking, and interactions with our youth and communities, and makes us change the ways we do business in our own arena as well as within the broader community.

Kentucky's Response to Safe Schools

Lois Adams-Rodgers, Director, Kentucky Center for School Safety

Kentucky has the distinction of having had one of the tragic school shooting incidents. In December of 1997, a young man shot at students gathered in a prayer circle before school at Heath High School. He killed several students, injured others, and left one girl paralyzed. The son of a well-known and respected family had no response when asked why he did such a thing.

The Kentucky Safe Schools Act

Tragically, this event is not unlike those that have occurred in many states, involving young, gun-wielding boys. But Kentucky, unlike some states, did not create policy through legislation specifically as a result of that act. In fact, Kentucky's safe schools legislation was actually already in its beginning stages during the 1996 session of the General Assembly. The legislation did not pass at that time, but the discussions between policy makers and representatives of the teachers' association, administrators' association, and school boards association paved the way for the passage of House Bill 330, Kentucky's Safe Schools Act, in 1998. There are two major components of this legislation – a grant program for school districts and the establishment of the Center for School Safety at a state university.

School Safety Assessments, Plans, and Grants

The genius of the Act is its flexibility, accountability, and fiscal support for schools and school districts. The bill requires school safety assessments to be completed by schools around a framework, but not in any particular format. Those assessments are then used by the district's broad-based school safety committee to create a district safety plan. These elements must be completed in order to be eligible for school safety grant funds.

Broadening the circle of discussion through the development and use of the school assessments provides for a variety of concerns and initiatives to be addressed, using school safety grant funds. House Bill 330 provided a $15 million appropriation during the 1998-2000 biennium. During the first year of the biennium, $4 million was awarded for grants, while $1 million was used for the start-up and implementation of the Center for School Safety. The first year's grants were earmarked specifically for alternative programs and were administered by the Kentucky Department of Education, since the Center for School Safety was not established until January, 1999. During the second year of the biennium, $9 million in grant funds were used to support the first year's grants, plus 53 new grants. In addition to a continuation and expansion of alternative programs, support is being provided to school districts for a variety of prevention, training, and intervention programs aimed at teachers, students, parents, communities, and agencies that provide services to students.

Of the 176 school districts in Kentucky, 126 have funding support from the Safe Schools grant funds. The Center for School Safety has responsibility for the administration of the grant funds, in addition to the monitoring and program review of the grants.

The Center for School Safety

The second major component of House Bill 330 is the establishment of the Center for School Safety. Following the passage of this bill, the Governor appointed a 12-member Board of Directors, comprised of five state agency commissioners/secretaries or their designees, and seven individuals, including a juvenile judge, a teacher, an administrator, a parent, classified staff, and a school board member. The Board's first major task was to create a Request for Proposal and select a site for the Center for School Safety at a public university. Since there are eight public universities in Kentucky, there was the potential of receiving eight different proposals. Two joint proposals were received, which represented collaborative efforts between the majority of the state universities.

The Board of Directors selected the proposal submitted by Eastern Kentucky University in collaboration with the University of Kentucky, Murray State University, and the Kentucky School Boards Association. The central functions of the Center are located at Eastern Kentucky University and each partner agency is responsible for a major Center function. The University of Kentucky operates the Clearinghouse and identifies best practices, Murray State coordinates with the other institutions of higher education in providing pre-service and continuing education training to teachers and administrators, the Kentucky School Boards Association trains and provides technical assistance for schools and communities, and Eastern Kentucky University has responsibility for the Justice and Law Enforcement component. Through the use of a comprehensive work plan, the Center functions in a collaborative manner. The value of collaboration cannot be over-emphasized, but it is a continuing challenge to make sure that all of the collaborators understand their roles and responsibilities and those of their partners.

Initially, the Center for School Safety operated with co-directors – one from Eastern Kentucky University (Dr. Bruce Wolford) and the other from the University of Kentucky (Dr. Lois Adams-Rodgers). However, after conducting a search, the Board of Directors selected Dr. Lois Adam-Rodgers to serve as their full-time director beginning in mid-August, 1999. This appointment was particularly important to the Board as the implementation of the work plan and preparation for the 2000 legislative session commenced.

Conclusion

The message that the Center for School Safety represents is that school safety is an instructional issue. It is not about metal detectors, locked doors, or any other single component that a school includes in its safety assessment. To properly address school safety, we should begin the first time each and every student comes to school. As educators, we need to make sure that the educational program is appropriate for each child. We must pay attention to all types of relationships within our school setting, and create an atmosphere where respect and dignity are taught, modeled, and expected.

The issue of school safety cannot be driven by the individual, tragic events that have taken place in our nation's schools. It must be driven by the fact that to be effective, schools must provide a

safe and secure learning environment where all students can learn, all teachers can teach, and parents are welcome as an essential part of the team. Kentucky's School Safety Act provides the opportunity for schools and communities to broaden the circle and to create just such learning environments to support the nearly 1,400 schools in the Commonwealth.

Arkansas' Initiatives to Prevent Youth Violence

J.B. Robertson, Field Services Specialist/Guidance
Arkansas Department of Education

I have been reflecting on the kinds of actions being taken to address school safety and how to identify those who could be involved in violent acts. Dress codes are currently being examined by every school in Arkansas. Can you tell by the way a person is dressed or the way he or she looks if they have the potential to commit a violent act? With the manner in which students dress these days, I think it would be hard to identify any particular potential for violence they may have. We have schools that are using metal detectors, video cameras, school resource officers, and various other types of security measures. Is this emphasis on safety making students feel safe or unsafe at school? Are we making kids feel unsafe in our communities because of the kinds of things we are doing in the name of safety? When you walk down the street and pass a store that has bars on the windows and doors, it is hard to decide if this is a place you would like to shop. If we start making our schools look this way, will students feel safe there?

How Adults React to School Violence Matters

All of us need to think more carefully about what we are doing to increase school safety. We need to let students talk about their problems. We need to listen to them and try to understand how they feel. Have you been watching television programs with parents being interviewed concerning their views on school violence? While watching these news reports, we see some parents react the way they should as they comfort their child, but other parents react with fear and anger. Parents, as well as other adults, can help kids feel safer by saying more positive things about making our communities safer and modeling appropriate behaviors. This is an important contribution all adults can make.

Does it help when television stations show the same violent acts repeatedly? The people in the Jonesboro area are tired of seeing the incident that occurred in their community replayed on television. It makes them relive that terrible day. We need to get past these events and allow people to move on with life. As kids at Columbine High School have asked, "When do we start seeing the positive things we are now doing, and how we are really putting things back together and healing here at our high school?"

Arkansas' Initiatives to Address School Violence

I want to share with you some of the things we are doing in Arkansas to address school violence. We have allocated about $5 million dollars during the past five years from state and federal funds, including Safe and Drug Free Schools funds, to address issues related to school violence. Schools funds have many initiatives. Some were developed at the state level and others are the product of federal or other national programs. I will describe each of them briefly, beginning with our home-grown efforts.

State Programs

I co-chair a subcommittee of the Coordinated School Health Program, which is developing guidelines for establishing the role of school resource officers. *Common Ground* is a group comprised of people from the community and local churches. It provides assistance to those in need of food and shelter. Also, it addresses abuse problems, violence, and other domestic issues. We are conducting workshops and other training on character education through the statewide *Smart Start Program* and school counseling programs. We have mental health staff in Jonesboro and other areas of the state who provide extended care services free of charge.

The state legislature passed an act that created a Safe Schools Committee, comprised of members of the Arkansas Department of Education, the Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services, and the community. This legislation was not as inclusive as laws that some other states have enacted, but the Committee has recommended a variety of actions and programs to address school violence in the state. In addition, it has challenged schools to adopt awareness, prevention, and intervention programs.

We have a program called *Smart Choices, Better Chances*, which the Attorney General's office administers. Staff from that office go into schools and present curricula and prevention programs for students in grades 4 through 12. They explain the juvenile laws and impart an understanding of the kinds of actions for which there are consequences, including being arrested. These programs have made our young people, especially those in the middle grades, realize that adults are not the only ones who can go to jail. Previously, we had promoted the idea that if you are a juvenile, you can commit a crime and get out of jail the next day. We no longer do that.

In 1991, the Lieutenant Governor convened a panel of 30 people from around the state to develop a suicide crisis management model. The panel surveyed the state to identify school-level needs before creating the model. Statewide workshops were provided to assist in using the model for developing plans at the local levels. In 1994, schools were asked to expand these plans to include all types of crisis situations. This work has now been transferred to the Attorney General's Office. The Arkansas Department of Education is currently printing the *AR Safety N.E.T.* resource guide, which will include the model and provide additional information for districts to use as they address various kinds of crises. For example, it will provide guidance to school personnel on how to deal with weapons in school and intruders, and what to do when various other kinds of incidents occur. These models can be easily adapted in any school district.

The Arkansas Department of Justice and the Arkansas Dispute Resolution Commission have provided a conflict resolution program to school counselors at no cost. This includes a curriculum notebook and a three-hour orientation session for school counselors and other educators in using these materials. More than 400 copies have been distributed to school counselors.

We have a wonderful group of school counselors in our state. Most of them are engaged in

character-building activities. They assist students through individual counseling, group counseling, and classroom guidance activities. (State legislation has mandated that 75 percent of our counselors' time be spent in providing direct services with students.) School counselors consult with community agencies, make referrals, and work with students who are outside the mainstream of education or who are at risk. We have changed how we talk about students and work with students. Legislation also requires counselors to prepare a written student services plan outlining the kinds of activities and services counselors will provide to their students. Hopefully, these plans will include activities to help students handle their anger and teach them how to resolve conflicts without resorting to violence.

We are trying to promote opportunities for people in Arkansas to have interactive discussions. The Arkansas Education Television Network is currently working on programs concerning safe schools. Since there is an interactive downlink site at the Arkansas Department of Education, there will be opportunities to air call-in programs.

National programs

We participate in the federally-funded Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Through this program, we are conducting in-service training for school drug education coordinators and school counselors, to provide up-to-date information about appropriate prevention techniques they can share with other staff in their local school districts. The statewide drug education coordinators have been able to use Federal funds available through this program to buy materials and equipment to carry out their responsibilities in many areas, including preventing school violence.

We participate in the Mid-South Summer School program, which is held the second week in June at the University of Arkansas in Little Rock. It is a nationwide program aimed at teachers and other educators, conducted through a satellite downlink. In 1999, Arkansas educators constituted 200 of 1,800 participants nationwide. The program covers many topics in education and prevention. It provides an opportunity for people to saturate themselves in this subject for an entire week.

We have been fortunate to have Dr. Marlene Young from the National Office of Violence Assistance (NOVA) in Washington, D.C., come to our state several times. NOVA is a private, nonprofit membership organization of victim- and witness-assistance practitioners, criminal justice professionals, researchers, former victims, health and mental health professionals, clergy, and others committed to the recognition and implementation of victims' rights. Its mission is to provide victims with justice and healing. NOVA's activities are guided by four purposes: national advocacy, providing direct crisis services to victims, serving as an educational resource for victim-assistance and allied professionals, and promoting better communication among its membership. We have had more than 300 people in our state trained in the NOVA model.

We also have had training from San Diego School District school counselors, at no charge. One of the several resources provided in this training was *Psychological First Aid*, a booklet that addresses actions related to meeting the needs of victims of violence, including survivors of

victims who were killed or injured. These include providing for their safety and ensuring their connection with care givers, providing them with an opportunity to "tell their story," making it clear that most reactions to horrific events are not abnormal, assisting survivors in predicting the practical issues they will face in the aftermath, and helping them prepare for and address these issues.

The *In a Flash* video has been made available for free to all middle schools. Schools at other grade levels can acquire the video at a nominal charge from the National Emergency Medicine Association. In addition, there is a booklet available for children at the elementary level. Some of our school counselors have obtained one for every student in their schools. When I first found out about this program, I asked how it was funded. It turned out that one of the largest contributors was from Arkansas, so I called and asked for multiple copies. They immediately sent me 400 videos and 1,000 booklets. As a result, most school districts in Arkansas now have a copy of this video. Not only does it address the immediate effects of violence, but it explores indirect effects as well, such as its effects on relatives, medical personnel, and the community at large. Also, it describes what happens when a bullet enters your body, such as what happens if a bullet hits a bone. The video has had a profound effect on the young people and others who have viewed it.

The Arkansas Department of Education's objective is to ensure that all Arkansas students have the opportunity to learn in an emotionally safe place as well as a physically safe place. In light of the widespread availability of information and training, much of which is summarized above, there is no excuse for school officials not to address school safety. All of them should be prepared to address a school crisis.

Conclusion

I believe that violence is preventable, but all of us need to get involved to achieve this goal. We must plan to systematically address the issues that cause violence. We should begin by collecting data and assessing the situation in our communities. Next, we should identify others with similar goals and collaborate with them. (One group we often leave out, but should include, is the victims.) Then, we should develop a plan that identifies the actions needed to achieve our goals by working together collaboratively. Lastly, we should implement that plan and update it periodically.

I will leave you with a few challenges that I hope will stimulate you to be part of the solution for this community problem:

- Create community hubs like the Family Resource and Youth Services Centers here in Kentucky. We can open churches for the community to use for various activities. There are many facilities available that could be used to create a community hub.
- Get kids involved in helping each other through peer tutoring and other peer-to-peer programs. Among other things, this will reduce their isolation. Most of the kids who commit violent acts have detached themselves from other people.

- Engage latchkey kids. Consider "adopting" a kid in your neighborhood by providing him or her with opportunities to participate in activities. Pay a kid's way to play baseball or another activity, initiate a sports program, offer to care for a neighbor's child, clean up a playground, prepare meals, call the nearest children's hospital to volunteer, and read a book to a child who has no one to do this with them. All of us have some kind of special skill or talent that we could share with a child.

Last, we need to let kids know that it is okay to be angry, but it is not okay to hit. That applies to adults as well as to children. We have many adults who do not know how to handle anger. No wonder children have become violent when they see adults acting violently and getting away with it.

We have a wealth of talent and energy throughout the United States, and working together we are going to make a difference. We will take back our communities and our schools, and improve the quality of life for all of us.

Buckner Alternative High School

Blake Haselton, Chairman, Board of Directors, Kentucky Center for School Safety and Superintendent, Oldham County Schools

This is a presentation on Buckner Alternative High School in Oldham County, Kentucky, where I have been superintendent for the last seven years.

From time to time, I ask my staff what we can do to provide opportunities for them to achieve better results for their students -- to make them more successful academically, to provide more opportunities and to increase their chances of being successful in society. The things I hear most commonly are: "We need more money, we need better kids, we need more supportive parents, and we need smaller class sizes." We are not going to get any of those four things. If we do, we are going to be trading off some other resources.

As we talk about violence in schools and promoting safe school atmospheres, I have heard the comment made that a student is nine times more likely to be killed at home by his own parents than in any type of a school-related issue. The latter includes being killed on a bus, in an athletic event, or dying of an injury at a school event where some accident occurs, as well as being a victim of school violence. Yet children are nine times more likely to be killed by their parents in the home. This statistic does not include dying at the hands of intruders or strangers, or other things we hear about. That is pretty alarming if it is accurate, and I have no reason to believe it is not accurate.

Elements of a Model Alternative School

Before we established an alternative school, we spent a two-year period conducting research, which included visiting several alternative schools and having a lot of discussions in our community. We identified several elements of a model alternative school and then tried to implement them. We concluded that schools are reflections of the community.

I sometimes talk to parents who express concern about drugs and weapons in schools. One of the responses I give them is that those are not things we issue along with textbooks and other materials that are essential to learning. We do not say to students, "Here are your textbooks, here is your locker, here are your materials, and by the way, here are your drugs and here is your gun." Those are things that come out of the community.

Another point we need to emphasize is that we do not believe that barriers, in and of themselves, are good techniques for preventing violence and promoting safe schools. We looked at some of the barrier methods other schools have used, and we came to the conclusion that in each and every one of them, they would not have prevented the violence that occurred in Jonesboro. We understand that there were staff from Columbine High School presenting at a National School

Boards Association meeting on school violence the day the incident took place there. If you

look at all the barriers that should be in place to physically manage students, you could pick Columbine as a model. They had school resource officers, video cameras, security, locked doors, etc.

We believe the key ingredient to addressing school violence and other dysfunctional behaviors is relationships -- the promotion of positive relationships between adults and students and between students and students. Also, relationships between the home community, the business community, and the school community are critical. It is very alarming that the incidents of school violence in the past several years were all committed by students who were in the school. In the past, violence in schools has been caused by outsiders. None of the recent incidents were committed by outsiders. This fact reinforced our concern about the relationships we have with and among our students. It is crucial to build positive relationships, not necessarily with the perpetrators of violent incidents, but with other students who could have known, should have known, or, in fact, did know about these incidents.

I also emphasize to our community that school safety is not my only problem, and it is not my problem alone. It is the responsibility of everyone. If someone asks me what I am going to do about school safety in our community, my response is, "It is a shared responsibility for our entire community." We put most of the focus on school safety in our school district on students. We tell them safety and security is their responsibility. If we have an incident, it is because we did not know enough to prevent it from occurring.

Although intruders are not a major cause of violence in our schools, we pay particular attention to this possibility. We have four correctional institutions and a psychiatric center in our county, so we are not dealing with the normal issues you would find in an average community. One of our two large campuses has an elementary school, a middle school, a high school, an alternative school, and a career center. It is right next door to the Kentucky State Reformatory, within sight of the campus. We have had some success with educating the school community about intruders, and about "tourists" – people who do not have any business being there.

The Wrong Approach

Our visits to alternative schools also taught us what not to do. We concluded that the organization of the alternative schools we visited was a real problem. We observed that they put their most challenging kids with their most challenged staff. Principals who cannot hack it or are not successful in a regular school are assigned to an alternative school. Rather than dismiss the most marginal teachers, they are placed in the alternative school. There is also the need for a separate facility for an alternative school. We found them in portable facilities or in dumps on the other side of campuses. We also found that, typically, these schools do not have adequate equipment, furniture, or supplies.

Then we wonder why alternative schools do not work. We staff them with our worst leaders and most challenged staff, put them in the worst location, and provide them with equipment that should have been surplused. Further, we give them little if any support for achieving measurable results. Next we look at alternative schools and say, "Gosh, we think they really need to use the

lock-down model." Frequently, we start out with good intentions and then decide to use a lock-down model because that is the kind of mentality the adults in the buildings have. They have not been successful with kids in a traditional or regular setting, so they create a punitive environment. What kind of relationships do they have with students in those alternative schools? Very poor ones.

Oldham County Schools' Philosophy and Approach

We have some beliefs that are somewhat unique. Philosophically, we think that decisions should be made for the benefit of kids. Some educators may argue with this point. But I will tell you from 25 years of experience in school administration, schools are generally not focused on kids. Schools are focused on adults. When we make decisions in the school business, frequently we are basing them on how they affect adults -- those in the community, in the school, on the school board, on the school council, and the principal or administrators. If anyone disagrees with that, I would love to visit your school district and observe how you have overcome that.

A culture we have tried to create in our school district is to measure the results of a program or activity, rather than focus on the use of resources, whether of time, personnel, or funds. Our criterion is, "How is this program providing for increased achievement or opportunities for kids?" We try to measure that. We do not emphasize what people are doing as much as the results they are getting. Part of the emphasis of the Kentucky Center for School Safety is on data. What kind of data are we going to be able to show to the governor and the legislature? Much of our experience thus far has been modeled by the Center for School Safety in North Carolina.

The establishment of an alternative school in Oldham County was the major priority of our teachers for three years. We asked them what they needed in order to do a better job. One response was to provide an alternative setting. We decided establishing an alternative program was more important than higher salaries or lower class sizes.

Every year there is an effort to remove disruptive students from what we call our "traditional" schools – not traditional in the sense that you may know it as. I am talking about a high school that is supposed to meet the needs of any student who appears in the doorway. The strategy is to remove students who are disruptive from the traditional setting and place them in an alternative setting so the regular school can function as it is meant to -- allow teachers to teach and students to learn. This approach also is intended to provide high quality experiences for those students who are placed in an alternative setting.

We have found there are generally three different types or scenarios in alternative schools, and that it is very hard to do all three. One is the "lock-down" approach, in which you have a secure setting. It is almost like a mini-jail, where students are very tightly controlled. It is like a prison in that it is intended to punish.

The second approach is an alternative setting in which students who have had attendance, academic, or discipline problems and have not been successful in a regular school environment are looking for a more structured environment -- one that is much more personalized and individualized. Under this approach, students have individual educational plans, regardless of whether they are special education students. Relationships are vitally important, and people know each other. It is a very small school setting similar to a one-room school. It may have multi-age, multi-ability students working together.

The third type is similar to a self-contained classroom for behaviorally disturbed students who cannot function in a regular school environment. They cannot go to the bathroom or to the cafeteria by themselves. This is the least restrictive environment for those students. There is a range of students who are emotionally or behaviorally disturbed and cannot function in a regular school.

Buckner Alternative High School

When we established Buckner Alternative High School, we tried to meet the needs of all of these types of students. This was extremely difficult. I cannot claim that we have been totally successful, but I can tell you that the results appear to be very promising. The school staff at the alternative school in Oldham County is unusual. We have teachers certified in special education and elementary education, rather than high school or middle school teachers. Elementary school teachers bring a culture with them that is much more nurturing than middle school or high school teachers bring. In addition, the school has a nurse who teaches basic nutrition and health-related issues, a corrections officer, a social worker, and two art therapists. Its principal has a background of working with emotionally disturbed and learning-disabled children. He has been principal of a middle school and co-principal of a high school in a large, urban, inner-city area. There are 20 staff members and 85 students.

What is the worst day of the week in an alternative school? Monday. Although school staff may have a lot of success with students Monday through Friday, on the weekends these children go right back into the same culture that resulted in the behavior that got them there or reinforced the behavior. Staff are dealing with situations that they do not know about. It is important not only to have an appropriate school structure in place, but to develop family and personal contacts to enable parents to feel comfortable in paging a staff member or calling a hotline if they need help over the weekend. Also, it is important to establish a link with the social worker who has close contact with the family. We have established and maintained very good working relationships with our district judges, county police, the health department, and social service agencies. The school has an office suite that is available to staff from outside agencies who may need to see a kid or who we need to support the kid. The school has telephones, fax machines, and other equipment these staff members can use. They are part of the partnership we have to address students' needs.

The key to Buckner Alternative High School's success is the relationships our staff have with our students. We use peer tutors, peer mediation, and other techniques, but the key is relationships between staff and their kids. Our traditional high school staff must be out in the

hallway. All staff are required to participate in extra-curricula activities. We require staff to be engaged with students outside of class. Staff who say they cannot do that need to find somewhere else to work. In this school, we think it is important for staff to be involved in some manner with kids, outside the classroom. It can be Chess Club; it can be Beta Club. It does not have to be athletics. It can be any club10 kids want to sign up for. As a result, we have a very high percentage of kids involved in extra-curricula activities.

We know from research that the common factor for students who are successful in school is participation in extra-curricular activities. It is not socioeconomic factors. Extra-curricular participation promotes a feeling of "ownership" the students have with what is going on at school. So we emphasize this. It builds strong relationships because adults are in front of the students all the time, rather than only in an academic setting which may be threatening. We have strived to create a supportive environment where adults are trying to help kids succeed in a variety of settings.

I am proud that we had 17 students graduate from our alternative school last year. Those students met the same requirements that apply to our "traditional" students. They have to be proficient in technology and meet the same academic, attendance, and discipline requirements as any other student who receives a diploma from the Oldham County Board of Education. In addition, they must have apprentice writing and math portfolios. The difference is that the alternative school provides a much more personalized experience.

Even though we have been successful in awarding our alternative students diplomas, we are now finding that our follow-up process also is very important. These students know that after they leave the school, they still have a safety net. They can come back to the school and talk to staff about issues or problems they may have.

Conclusion

Adolescents, in my opinion, have a culture of their own. For those of you who are looking for a fast-read book about the teenage culture that we are dealing with today, there is an excellent book called *A Tribe Apart*. I saw a lot of my own kids and a lot of my own parenting in that book. It gives you an idea of how relationships between adults and kids are nowhere near where we think they are. Adolescents are a tribe apart from where you and I are, and we have made them a tribe apart. Our society has changed dramatically. Workplaces have changed dramatically. The home situation has changed rapidly. All of these factors are important. It is up to us as educators and other children's service providers to create supportive environments and institutions in which all of our children can succeed. We think we are making progress towards this goal in the Oldham County Schools. You can, too.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration

September 15-18, 1999

The Galt House Hotel
Fourth Avenue at the River
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 589-5200 - Phone (502) 585-4266 - FAX

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1999

11:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**REGISTRATION**	*3rd Floor Hallway*
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**LUNCH AND SITE VISIT OVERVIEW** **OVERVIEW OF FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS AND YOUTH SERVICES CENTERS** *Sandy Goodlett, Executive Director* *Office of Family Resource and Youth Service Centers, Kentucky*	*Jones Room*
1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.	**TRAVEL TIME**	
1:30 p.m. – 4::30 p.m.	**SITE VISITS TO YOUTH SERVICES CENTERS AND FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS** (Please see site visit information sheet for assignments)	
4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**TRAVEL TIME**	

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1999

7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**REGISTRATION**	*3rd Floor Hallway*
7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	**CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST**	*Jones Room*
8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.	**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS** *Cynthia Brown, Director* *Resource Center on Educational Equity* *Council of Chief State School Officers*	*Jones Room*

8:45 a.m. – 10:45a.m. **INNOVATIONS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION** *Jones Room*

Moderator: Cynthia Brown, Director
CCSSO, Resource Center on Educational Equity

Building early childhood education infrastructure and coordination
Karen Ponder, Director, North Carolina Partnership for Children

Using Title I and state funds to build quality preschool programs
Tony Bucci, Director, Title I Services
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, N.C.

Barbara Pellin, Assistant Superintendent
Student, Family and Community Services
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, N.C.

Assessing the effectiveness of preschool programs in Kentucky and a preview of the State's new twenty-year early childhood education plan
Kim F. Townley, Executive Director
Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development, Kentucky

10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. **BREAK**

11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **FIRST TEAM PLANNING SESSION**
(Please see instruction sheet for room assignments and guidelines.)

12:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. **LUNCH** Wilkinson *Room*

1:45 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. **INTERVENTIONS TO PREVENT AND REDUCE ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND PROMOTE PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR** *Jones Room*

Academic researchers present their findings and recommendations regarding antisocial behaviors among children and how to address them. Also, the results of a comprehensive study of the entry-level skills, knowledge, and behaviors children need to succeed in school will be presented.

Moderator: Cynthia Brown, Director
CCSSO, Resource Center on Educational Equity

Steven Asher, Professor of Psychology
Duke University

Ann Kaiser, Professor of Special Education and Psychology
Center for Research on Human Development
Vanderbilt University

Sharon Schattgen, Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

3:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. **BREAK**

4:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. **STATE-TO-STATE PEER CONSULTATION TEAM PLANNING**
(Please see instruction sheet for room assignments and guidelines)

6:00 p.m. - 6:45 p.m. **RECEPTION** *Brown Room*

6:45 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. **DINNER** *Carroll/Ford Room*

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1999

7:30 a.m. - 8:30 a.m. **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** *Jones Room*

8:30 a.m. - 10:30 p.m. **INCREASING SCHOOL SAFETY THROUGH INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS TO BETTER ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF YOUTH** *Jones Room*
Moderator: Richard Murphy, Director
Center for Youth Development and Policy Research

The Talent Development Model: Dividing schools into small centers to reduce alienation and create a climate that is conducive to learning
Bonnie Erickson, Education Consultant
and former Principal, Patterson High School, Baltimore, MD

Project Learn: Providing support to children and youth after school
Carter J. Savage, Senior Director, Education Programs
Boys and Girls Clubs of America

Developmental Assets: Identifying the building blocks of healthy development that young people need to grow up to be healthy, caring and responsible
Judy Taccogna, Director, Education Sector, Search Institute

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **BREAK**

10:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. **SECOND TEAM PLANNING SESSION**
STATE-TO-STATE
PEER CONSULTATION
(Please see instruction sheets for room assignments and guidelines)

12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m. **LUNCH** *Breathitt Room*

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. **SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION**
(Please see instruction sheet for room assignments and guidelines)

A series of small group discussions among peers – those working in similar disciplines or types of jobs – to provide an opportunity to consult with one another on the challenges they confront in eliminating barriers to effective collaboration, strategies they have found successful in overcoming them, and other issues of mutual concern.

3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. **BREAK**

3:45 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. **THIRD TEAM PLANNING SESSION**
(Please see instruction sheet for room assignments and guidelines)

EVENING FREE – DINNER ON YOUR OWN
(See list of suggested restaurants)

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1999

7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** *Jones Room*

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **PROGRAMS TO PREVENT YOUTH VIOLENCE** *Jones Room*

A review and discussion of state and local efforts designed to address and prevent youth violence

Moderator: Blake Haselton, Superintendent, Oldham County Public Schools & Chairman, Kentucky Center for School Safety

Lois Adams-Rogers Director
Kentucky Center for School Safety
Eastern Kentucky University

J. B. Robertson, Field Services Specialist
Arkansas Department of Education

Linda K. Bowen, Executive Director
National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention

10:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **MEETING WRAP-UP: DISCUSSION OF NEXT MEETING AND OTHER FUTURE NETWORK ACTIVITIES** *Jones Room*

Where do we go from here?

What kinds of support and services do you want CCSSO to provide to the Network?

APPENDIX B

Ensuring Student Success Through Collaboration

September 15-18, 1999 Conference

BIOGRAPHIES

The Galt House Hotel
Fourth Avenue at the River
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 589-5200 - PHONE (502) 585-4266 - FAX

LOIS ADAMS-RODGERS

Dr. Lois Adams-Rodgers is Director of the Kentucky Center for School Safety at Eastern Kentucky University. She assumed this role after serving as Director of the Institute on Education Reform at the University of Kentucky for two years. Dr. Adams-Rodgers also serves as Associate Professor of Education Administration at the University of Kentucky.

Dr. Adams-Rodgers served as Deputy Commissioner for Learning Support Services in the Kentucky Department of Education for seven years, and has served as superintendent of the Jessamine County Schools, assistant superintendent, elementary and middle school principal in the Henry County Schools, special education program developer in Carroll and Henry Counties, elementary teacher in Jefferson County Schools, and State Director of the Office of Exceptional Children Services in the Kentucky Department of Education.

Dr. Adams-Rodgers holds a B.A., M.Ed., and Ed.D from the University of Louisville. Her academic areas of interest and expertise include leadership for systematic change, organizational design, school governance, curriculum and instructional strategies and professional development. Her research interests are in the area of middle schools, leadership development, women's issues, and the superintendency.

STEVEN R. ASHER

Steven R. Asher is a Professor of Psychology in the Department of Psychology: Social and Health Sciences at Duke University. He is on leave from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where he has been a Professor of Educational Psychology since 1971. Other academic appointments have been as a visiting scholar at UCLA (1980) and the University of Maryland (1984-85).

Dr. Asher grew in Newark, New Jersey. He did his undergraduate work at Rutgers University in Newark, New Jersey and his doctoral work in psychology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. At Illinois and at Duke, he has taught undergraduate and graduate courses in the area of children's social and personality development. For 13 of his years at Illinois, he served as the Director of the Bureau of Educational Research.

Dr. Asher's research is focused on the development of children's peer relationships. Within this area, he has done research on loneliness in childhood, the development of social competence, and on the effects of social skills training on children's acceptance by peers. He has also done research on the social relationships of children in racially desegregated schools and in classrooms that integrate regular education and special education students. His most recent research is focused on how the goals children pursue in conflict situations affect their success in making and keeping friends.

Dr. Asher is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association (Divisions 7, 9, and 15) and the American Psychological Society. He has served on the editorial boards of *Child Development, Developmental Psychology, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* and the *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships*. Dr. Asher is the co-editor of two books, *The Development of Children's Friendships* (1981) and *Peer Rejection in Childhood* (1990), both published by Cambridge University Press. He has been an elected member of the governing boards of the Society for Research in Child Development, the American Educational Research Association, and the Division of Developmental Psychology of the American Psychological Association.

Steven Asher is married to Gladys Williams. They have three children, Matt, David, and Michael. Each Spring, Steve waits for a call from the major leagues asking him to play second base. He attributes his interest in the topic of peer rejection to growing up in Newark and to rooting for a team, the Brooklyn Dodgers, that almost always lost the big games and then moved away after they finally won.

LINDA K. BOWEN

Linda K. Bowen is the Executive Director of the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention. She has more than 14 years of experience in program administration and development, policy analysis, and research, in areas such as the development of legislation, family advocacy, and programs for children and families. Ms. Bowen served as Special Assistant to the Commissioner of the Administration for Children and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services; as Assistant Dean for Enrollment and Placement at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration; and as Associate Director for Programs at the Center for Successful Child Development (The Beethoven Project) in Chicago. Ms. Bowen has a bachelor's degree in Human Behavior from the University of Chicago and a Master's degree in Social Work from the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago.

ANTHONY F. BUCCI

Anthony F. Bucci, known to most as Tony, is from Huntersville, NC, and the Director of Title I Services for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, in Charlotte, NC. Charlotte-Mecklenburg is the 25th largest district in the United States. Originally from Syracuse, NY, Tony has spent virtually his entire career as a professional educator.

Tony brings to his work experience and perspectives from teaching, administration, legislative, and policy-making positions. He was a classroom teacher for 15 years. He also was a member of the adjunct faculty in the departments of education for his alma mater, LeMoyne College, for seven years and for the SUNY Health Science Center's, College of Health-Related Professions for three years. His administrative experience includes curriculum coordinator for the Skaneateles Central Schools, a special programs administrator at the Onondaga-Cortland-Madison Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and a supervisor in the Office of Quality Assurance for the New York State Education Department. For three years, he also served as staff director for a member of the New York State Assembly. Also, for seven years, while teaching in rural and suburban Syracuse, he served as a member of the Syracuse Board of Education, including two years as the Board's president.

In his current position, Tony has been a leading advocate for Title I as a catalyst for school reform. He established a collaborative team approach for administering and implementing Title I services. He has provided leadership in developing and implementing performance-based instructional units in elementary schools. Tony is also project manager for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Bright Beginnings Program - a pre-kindergarten program for four-year-old children with a demonstrated educational need. CMS Bright Beginnings is a child-centered program with a strong focus on language development and emergent literacy. Eighty-five percent of the program is supported with 85% of the district's Title I funds.

Beyond his daily responsibilities, Tony is involved both personally and professionally at the state and local levels. He is a member of the North Carolina Committee of Practitioners, a member of the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Association of Compensatory Educators, a member of the Board and President-elect of Leadership Charlotte, and Chair of the executive committee for St. Peter Catholic Church in Charlotte. He has served over the years as members and chair of numerous state, local, and national committees. He has been a presenter at various regional, state, and national conferences since 1977. In 1997, the North Carolina Association of Compensatory Educators (NCACE), and the National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators (NAFEPA) presented him with leadership awards.

He is a graduate of LeMoyne College in Syracuse, with a Bachelor's Degree in history. His graduate work was done at the State University of New York, with a Master's Degree in secondary education from SUNY Cortland, and a Certificate of Advanced Study in curriculum and instruction from SUNY Oswego.

BONNIE S. ERICKSON

Originally from Minnesota, Ms. Erickson received her elementary and secondary education in Maryland public schools. Her undergraduate and graduate studies were accomplished at Towson State Teacher College (now Towson University) in Maryland. She has a B.S. degree in History and an M. Ed. in Administration and Supervision.

Ms. Erickson is a 35 year veteran of the Baltimore City Public Schools. She has:

1. taught social studies at the junior high school and senior high school levels.

2. been a social studies specialist supervising teachers in 13 middle and high schools.

3. been an assistant principal for 10 years.

4. been a principal for 3 years.

While principal at Patterson High School in Baltimore, Maryland, Ms. Erickson, in collaboration with Dr. James McPartland, director of CRESPAR (Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk) Johns Hopkins University, created the first Talent Development High School in the United States.

Since her retirement from Baltimore City Pubic Schools, Ms. Erickson has taken on a new challenge, working as a consultant and organizational facilitator for CRESPAR, taking the Talent Development High School Model to high schools across the United States.

BLAKE HASELTON

Blake Haselton, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Kentucky Center for School Safety (CSS), is currently serving his eighth year as Superintendent of Schools in the Oldham County Public Schools, a district of approximately 8,500 students.

His prior experience in education includes service as a Biology teacher, Guidance Counselor, Director of Guidance Services, Director of Pupil Personnel and, immediately prior to becoming Superintendent, seven years as Principal of a high school of over 2,100 students.

During his tenure as Principal at Oldham County High School, the school was recognized as exemplary by the U.S. Department of Education both in the Blue Ribbon Schools Program and the Drug Free Schools Program. He was also Kentucky Principal of the Year in 1989.

In addition to his school district activities, he has also served as Legislative Chairman for the Kentucky Association of School Administrators during three legislative sessions.

Mr. Haselton is currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Louisville and holds and Ed.S. in School Administration, an M.A.in Counseling and a B.S. in Agriculture and Biology, all from Western Kentucky University. He is a past recipient of the School's Distinguished Alumni Award.

KAREN W. PONDER

Karen W. Ponder is the Executive Director of the North Carolina Partnership for Children, the non-profit agency that oversees and gives technical support to Smart Start, North Carolina's early childhood initiative. She was formerly the Program Director of the agency. Prior to joining the North Carolina Partnership for Children, she was Program Manager for Smart Start at the North Carolina Department of Human Resources and helped to develop the Smart Start initiative at the state and community levels.

Karen has been involved in many aspects of early care and education, as a teacher, program director, board member, and trainer. As a partner in Childhood Enrichment Associates, she was a consultant to early childhood programs and trained teachers throughout the southeast. She has delivered numerous seminars and workshops. She has assisted more than 20 states in various aspects of planning and development of early childhood initiatives.

Karen graduated summa cum laude from North Carolina State University and has also completed coursework at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. She is a member of the Governing Board of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

J. B. ROBERTSON

J. B. Robertson is a Field Service Specialist/Guidance in the Arkansas Department of Education. In this capacity he serves approximately 1500 school counselors in the state of Arkansas in the areas of guidance, counseling, career education, and student services planning. He has worked from kindergarten through university levels of education as a school counselor, school psychologist, educational examiner, music teacher, gifted and talented programs, instructor in psychology, coordinated school health programs, and areas of school safety. He serves on intra-agency committees and works with the Arkansas Department of Health, Arkansas Department of Human Services, Arkansas Division of Mental Health and other state agencies in collaboration for providing services to all children.

CARTER JULIAN SAVAGE

Some say education is the passport to the future. If this is true, it is more important than ever to equip our nation's youth with the education necessary to succeed in the year 2000 and beyond. Carter Savage, senior director of education programs, is working to make this happen for millions of Boys & Girls Club youngsters nationwide.

In his role, Savage manages a comprehensive education enhancement initiative - Project Learn, designed to supplement what youth ages 6-18 learn in school. Developed by B&GCA, funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and evaluated by Dr. Stephen Schinke of Columbia University, Project Learn provides academic enrichment through tutoring and homework assistance, leisure learning activities, parental involvement, school collaborations, and rewards for participating youth.

Also a research fellow at the Race Relations Institute of Fisk University, Savage is examining the history of African-American education in the South, exploring the oral histories of students and teachers in Rosenwald and other segregated, black schools. He holds a doctorate degree in education, a master's in public policy and a bachelor's degree in mathematics from Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee.

SHARON FORD SCHATTGEN

Sharon Ford Schattgen is the newly appointed coordinator of curriculum and assessment for the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. She is the founding director of the Project Construct National Center, having served in this role from 1992 until September 1999.

Dr. Schattgen's work focuses on theory-based curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development. She is the author of several journal articles, book chapters, and technical reports pertaining to teacher education and student assessment and evaluation. She is a regular participant in state, regional, and national education conferences, having recently presented papers at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, the National Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators, the National Council on the Teaching of Mathematics, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Over the past few years, she has conducted numerous workshops for teachers, administrators, and other educators on a variety of topics pertaining to effective teaching practices.

Dr. Schattgen is the founding managing editor of The Constructivist, a scholarly magazine published by the Association for Constructivist Teaching. She is also a consulting editor for the Early Childhood Research Quarterly, a research journal published by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Dr. Schattgen earned a B.A. in psychology from Stephens College and a Ph.D. in educational psychology from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

JUDY TACCOGNA

Judy Taccogna is an experienced educator, counselor, and administrator at all levels within the school system. She has served as a principal, teacher, counselor, curriculum director, and staff developer, all in support of positive youth development.

As director/education sector, Search Institute, Taccogna provides leadership, strategic direction, and general management of Search Institute's activities and programs in the education sector. Specifically, she is developing a business plan for the education team, interfacing with national education partner organizations, and identifying Search Institute's education initiatives and generating outside funding to support those initiatives, among many other responsibilities.

Before joining Search Institute, Taccogna served as executive administrator of curriculum, instruction, and restructuring (K-12) for the Beaverton School District in Beaverton, Oregon, which consists of approximately 31,000 students. Prior to that she served as principal of two elementary schools in the district.

Ms. Taccogna holds an Ed.D. in educational administration/education leadership from Portland State University, Portland, Oregon; an Ed.M. in counseling and guidance from Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon; and a B.A. in elementary education and in literature from Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California.

KIM F. TOWNLEY

Dr. Townley is the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development. Dr. Townley has been involved in the field of early childhood development and education for almost three decades. Her work began in South Carolina as a public school kindergarten teacher. Dr. Townley has served as a Child Development Associate instructor for Head Start staff, is a validator for the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, and has directed early childhood laboratory schools at Chadron State College, the University of Nebraska and the University of Kentucky. In her tenure as a Laboratory Director she implemented full day programming for infant/toddlers, evening child care, and most recently contracted with Fayette County Schools to integrate a Kentucky Preschool Program with preschool children from families who had the ability to pay.

Throughout her career, Dr. Townley's research has encompassed the broad domain of environmental influences on the development of young children. As part of this research program she has investigated burnout of teachers in early care and education settings, has been part of the research team that is conducting the longitudinal study of the Kentucky Preschool Programs, and has conducted research related to children's perception of peace and how early childhood programs might implement peace education.

Dr. Townley has served as President of the Kentucky Association for Early Childhood Education twice, is a charter board member of the Kentucky School-Age Care Coalition, has served on the Early Childhood Advisory Council and the Child Care Policy Council, and has served as Chair of the Child Care Council of Kentucky.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)

PS030452